

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N<sup>o</sup> CXXI. OCTOBER 1905.

---

ART. I.—LIBERAL THEOLOGY: I.

1. *Exploratio Evangelica*. A Brief Examination of the Basis and Origin of Christian Belief. By PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D. (London: A. and C. Black, 1899.)
2. *Contentio Veritatis*. Essays in Constructive Theology. By SIX OXFORD TUTORS. (London: Murray, 1902.)
3. *The Ritschlian Theology, Critical and Constructive*. An Exposition and an Estimate. By A. E. GARVIE, M.A., B.D. Second Edition. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1902.)
4. *The Virgin Birth of Christ*. By P. LOBSTEIN. With an Introduction by W. D. MORRISON, LL.D. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1903.)

And many other works.

I.

THE present article is written as a contribution to the philosophy of Christian thinking. It is not primarily either historical or theological. It does not attempt either to narrate the growth or to exhibit the content of a theological movement. Its first concern is not with events in the history of human thought, but with principles and fundamental conceptions—not with books, not with men. Its aim is philosophical, and its immediate interest is apologetic. It

VOL. LXI.—NO. CXXI.

B

attempts to set forth the actual conceptions characteristic of Liberal Theology, and then asks concerning them—'What is their philosophical value, and how would they, if adopted, affect the reasoned presentation of our Faith?' Nor does this method seem to us inadequate; for Liberal Theology is dominated by philosophical conceptions, or at least by general conceptions that pertain to philosophy, and ordinarily its theological idiosyncrasies are consequential upon these. It is a doctrinal movement, but its formative doctrines are philosophical, not directly theological, and many of its adherents would confess to no loftier ambition than to restate old truths in a new and, as they think, more reasonable way. Even the denials of its more advanced representatives are determined by philosophy or by general conceptions which, whatever their history or theological ground, are certainly not derived from theology. A movement thus philosophical must be judged by philosophy, and met, if need be, by philosophy. Therefore our criticism is primarily philosophic, and incidental to it are certain constructive presentations which seem to us valuable for a right apprehension of the Christian Faith, and for the practical purposes of Christian Apologetic.

But the questions raised by Liberal Theology are not all of them doctrinal. The Creeds are legally normal within the practical system of the Church, the use of them in the public worship of the Church is obligatory, and they safeguard the threshold of Holy Orders. Because thus variously incident upon the minds and consciences of men, they give rise, in minds scrupulous to affirm novelties, to practical questions of grave moment. These questions, or some of them, will have to be considered in connexion with any conclusions at which we may arrive.

## II.

In the first place, what do we mean by Liberal Theology? Obviously, we mean theology informed by the Liberal spirit. But what is the Liberal spirit in theology?—how may we recognize it, and what are its aims?

The very idea of Liberalism carries with it the thought of



freedom and of more or less active protest. Liberalism, wherever we find it, is always—unless it be degenerate—a re-creative movement away from a fixed convention and a sterile tradition. Its true antithesis is not Conservatism, but Traditionalism that is *mere* Traditionalism—which sets forth and embodies only the achievements of the past, and not the present dynamic development of life in and through the forms of a continuous history and of a permanent, although changing, society. Such Traditionalism is always sterile, or, if it be in any degree productive, it brings forth only curious subtleties of thought and usage which witness to exhaustion and decadence, not to creative and out-reaching strength. Against Traditionalism of this kind—against its tyranny, if it be strong, against its uselessness, if it be feeble—Liberalism, if true to its own formative idea, is always and everywhere a re-creative revolt, informed and impelled by some new development of life which cannot make itself at home within established forms of practice.

As thus defined, then, Liberalism is but another name for healthily progressive Humanism. It is the natural creed of that developing spirit of man which, in its secular endeavour after the more abundant life, is ever shaping for itself new ways of thought and usage to be the instruments and expression of new needs and new ideals. But, if this definition be precise, how are we to define what is ordinarily called Conservatism? Does not this account of Liberalism imply that Conservatism is nothing more than another name for that dead or moribund Traditionalism against which Liberalism characteristically revolts? Yet this identification, if it be intended to mark more than a passing accident in history, is possible only to the fanatical, the unscrupulous and the ignorant—perhaps, indeed, we had never heard of it but for the exigencies and temptations of the baser kind of political rhetoric.

Sometimes, indeed, in this or that field of man's enterprise Conservatism temporarily appears in this unlovely guise—as the cult of an outworn tradition; but this guise is also a disguise, arising out of morbid accidents of history which are, fortunately, local and transient. Those who to-day—

despite a reasonable dislike of party names—prefer, upon the whole, for practical purposes to call themselves Conservative, would, if they essayed to define their creed, use the very same words, save one, that have just been used to define Liberalism. They would concede to Liberalism the word ‘natural,’ and, to set forth the characteristic difference of their creed, would claim for their own use the word ‘final,’ not because of completed achievement, but because of a distinctive tendency and an approximating movement. They recognize that Liberalism gives apt expression to reformers’ first thoughts; that, moved by these thoughts, the spirit of progressive change spontaneously, and therefore, in some sense, naturally, tends towards it as its distinctive creed. But they claim that second thoughts—the second thoughts of Humanism—are Conservative; that, when, with fuller experience and riper judgement, we re-affirm the Liberal creed, we re-affirm it in a form which, because more complete, is also more nearly final, and clearly entitles it to a new name.

What, then, from this point of view, is the characteristic difference between Conservatism and Liberalism, between the later creed of our reflective thought, and those early affirmations which it transcends? The difference, we think, is this: Liberalism, whether in politics or in theology, is distinctively a plea for liberty, and as a policy of change it is determined primarily by the thought of liberty; Conservatism, on the other hand, while not less mindful of liberty, is, in its constructive reforms, determined primarily by the thought of corporate life and of historic continuity. Because the formative work of history is carried on by a living tradition—a tradition embodied in organized forms of social life, articulate in historical creeds, and manifestly regulative in our governing ideals—Conservatives, in so far as they are true to the fundamental principles of their creed, endeavour in their reforms to establish such a relation between the tradition they guard and the new life which claims recognition that the tradition—it may be in some degree transformed—becomes healthfully organic to the aims and generously serviceable to the needs of that new life; and in so far as they succeed in this endeavour they make the new

life not merely a transmitter of their tradition but a continuator of it. Their primary interest is to make tradition humanely effective as an expression of human life, and an agent in human progress. Liberals, however, while not always unmindful of tradition, are more characteristically inclined to let the new life find new and independent expression and fashion for itself new and independent instruments. Conservatives, indeed, in their care for tradition, are sometimes too negligent of the changing needs of their changing times, but when this happens it is only a psychological incident, not a logical necessity, and it illustrates a weakness of human thought, not a philosophical defect in the Conservative creed.

As thus defined, then, Conservatism and Liberalism are contrasted forms of progressive thought, and the characteristic note of Liberalism is its pre-occupation with novelty.

### III.

After this preliminary inquiry, let us go back to the thought that Liberalism is a form of Humanism. Now, Humanism, if we take it in its most general meaning, is a doctrine, if not of self-realization, at least of self-expression. According to it the aims, the needs, the interests of human life are, or should be, supreme—to these usage, thought, and institutions are, or should be, plastic. In so far, then, as the Liberal movement in theology is a form of Humanism, it endeavours to bring Christian doctrine into a relation of vital helpfulness with the characteristic needs and temper of our time. Every such attempt—if we consider only its intention and not its method—must be wholly laudable. Religion exists for the service of man; even revealed religion is, and is intended to be, ancillary to human life. Our primary end we are told, is to glorify God, but this end *is* our end, not because of some arbitrary decree, irrelevant to our nature and our life, but because we are so constituted that only in proportion as our lives become God's 'highest praise' do we achieve those ends which our nature makes intrinsically valuable to us. God, because He is essentially Love, does not constrain us to any alien end, but appoints for our lives a

term wherein His purpose ends in our beatitude. It is true that the Christian religion is a religion of sacrifice, wherein man brings gifts to God. In and through the Church's corporate life our alms and oblations are given, in the first place, not to man but to God. Our praise and thanksgiving are a sacrifice to Him, and as a sacrifice, also, 'reasonable, holy, and lively,' we offer and present to Him our very selves—our souls and bodies—so that thenceforth all that we are and have are not our own but His, and even our daily work has its God-ward purpose. But sacrifice, whatever be its form, is not an end in itself, nor is it appointed by God for His tributary gain. In so far as it is appointed or sanctioned by God, it exists for the sake of man—because only in and through the relation with God established and confirmed by sacrifice can man reach the God-appointed but intrinsic end of his life.

Because religion is thus essentially subordinate to the needs of man and to the ends of his life, its ministry must be persuasively effectual through all the mutations of human affairs, through every change of human interest and every change of human thought. If at any time and in any place the ministry of religion prove ineffective, then religion itself has failed in its primary function, and this failure will be none the less failure even though unambiguous facts lead us to explain it by the hardness and wilfulness of men's vagrant hearts, rather than by some defect in religion or its ministers. Since, then, no believer—certainly no Christian believer—can rest content with such a failure, although it may be one that implies no condemnation of his religion or its exponents, the aim of Liberal Theology in its attempt to make the creed and the Christian faith more effectually missionary is an aim which every member of the 'household of faith' must unreservedly commend.

But in what way does Liberal Theology make this attempt? It accepts as normal the intellectual temper and tendency characteristic of our day, and essays to translate the Christian message into modern speech, and to attune it to modern ears. Now, whenever we essay to commend our Faith to those who have not received its promises, we naturally

adapt its message to their idiosyncrasies of temperament and of thought; for these idiosyncrasies are at least indicative of their characteristic aptitudes and needs. Our Liberal theologians, however, do more than this. They are themselves indoctrinated with the characteristic thought of our day, friendly to its philosophy, receptive of its methods. Therefore the spirit of the age is not only regulative of their missionary endeavours, it is normal for their thinking. Because they are thus the children of our changing time their primary interest in their own characteristic apologetic is not missionary but personal. Their defence of the Faith is, in the first place, a defence of their own position within the Catholic order.

Two things may be at once admitted without discussion. The Christian Faith must always make itself intelligible; it must always commend itself to the minds of men as a reasonable faith—and it must always be prepared to take up into itself—to 'baptize into Christ' according to Professor Percy Gardner's striking and felicitous phrase—every achievement of thought and every discovery of science. The Church's *Magnificat* should be eloquent of all the goodness of life; her 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' should be offered for all that makes life generously humane.

Let us look for a moment at these admissions. The first is accepted by men of all parties, and cannot give rise to any relevant controversy. Its words are clear and their meaning unambiguous. They point only to explanation, or, at the very most, to translation, and re-presentation—not to any change in the content of our Faith. Neither does the second convey any suggestion of such a change. Directly and immediately it points only to incorporation—to the enrichment of Christian thought with the gains of secular history. But to very many these gains seem, in themselves or in their results, to be inconsistent with the Christian tradition—so inconsistent that incorporation is impossible unless the tradition be modified in important particulars. The 'modern spirit,' we are told, has reached a new point of view, a new interpretation of the world-process, a new estimate of values. This achievement is said to bring us nearer to the truth of

things, and we are warned that we cannot reject it without most serious loss, without becoming obscurantist and hostile to the progressive movement of history, and cannot accept it without reconstructing the primary articles of our belief.

#### IV.

One would no more wish to be disrespectful to the *Zeit-Geist* than to the Equator, but it seems necessary to point out that a conception is not authoritative because it is contemporary, or because it is distinctively characteristic of contemporary thought, or even because it is fashionable. The thought of an age is very largely determined by the practical interests of the age, and by its spiritual character. If men are blind to the higher aspects of life, only feebly responsive to the world's higher influences, chiefly interested in things external and in the practical ends, whether of pleasure or utility, which those things can immediately subserve, it is probable—nay! inevitable—that their thought, except in so far as it is an inheritance from a better day, will bear the marks of their spiritual limitations, and even their catholic consent will not make it normal for Christian faith. In such a time the Church would be the guardian of a nobler Humanism, and, in the realm of thought, its characteristic mission would be corrective, its primary duty critical. Even in a healthier time it may easily happen that some striking conception, which usefully illuminates some limited field of Nature or of history, is uncritically made universal, and applied far beyond the limits of its first usefulness. Then, again, the missionary vocation of the Church may make Christian thought primarily protestant and corrective. The only authority is that of Truth—of things as they are; and, although Christian thought ought doubtless to be assimilative, we have neither *a priori* nor historical grounds for saying that it ought to be only and always assimilative. As good Churchmen we confess that 'General Councils have erred'; as historians we know that the 'Spirit of the Age' has often erred.

But what, in fact, are those characteristic achievements of the modern spirit which—sometimes with no slight suggestion



of menace—we are so persistently asked to accept? They may, we think, be properly and adequately subsumed under two ideas—the idea of Continuity, and that of Development.

The former of these is best known through the doctrine of the 'Uniformity of Nature,' and most impressively illustrated by scientific prediction. Through this connexion with natural science it has become part of the intellectual furniture of the age, and has for long been in the forefront of apologetic controversy. More recently, however, the idea has been usefully applied in the domain of history, and this new use of it has given rise to some of the most distinctive problems of our present-day apologetic.

We have then, apparently, three conceptions before us with which, we are told, Christian thought must come to terms:

- (a) The conception of the Uniformity of Nature.
- (b) The conception of the Continuity of History.
- (c) The conception of Development.

Let us take each of these in turn, and inquire whether they are really authoritative against the Christian *credenda*—whether they do, in fact, warrant or compel a modification of our teaching, and a revision of our characteristic *Welt-Anschauung*.

## V.

What is meant by the 'Uniformity of Nature?' For us, to-day, the question has not ordinarily the same polemical character as it once inevitably had. The 'scientific method'—which, by the way, is not Baconian—has been amply verified by results, and it is no longer practically necessary for the scientific inquirer, before commencing his distinctive work, to vindicate the very conception of natural order. The progress of knowledge and of thought has led to a general recognition that Nature is indeed Nature—a dynamic order and not Chaos. By this means Natural Science has won for itself a broad domain, with more or less clearly defined frontiers which even theologians do not as a rule invade, and within which the 'scientific method' exercises an



*imperium* that may well be called undisputed. Therefore, when we who are accustomed to this rule are asked to explain what we mean by the Uniformity of Nature, the question does not of necessity sound controversial, and we proceed to infer a non-polemical answer from the ordinary usages of Natural Science. Now, as implied in those usages or presupposed by them, the Uniformity of Nature appears to subsist only in constant relations between facts or groups of facts, and in the quantitative and qualitative correspondence between cause and effect. It is often said that the Uniformity of Nature subsists in the laws of Nature, but this, if taken strictly, implies a theological interpretation which, although substantially correct, is not in fact the proximate ground of scientific practice. Moreover, this account of the Uniformity of Nature is historically connected with a popular, if not a scientific, dualism, which regarded force and matter as not only distinguishable, but separate. According to this view of the physical world, matter is characteristically inert, and material things the vehicles, instruments, or manifestation-centres of independently existing Force. It was then easy to think of Force as obedient to Will, and of its Protean manifestations as resulting from an extrinsic determination analogous to human law-making. But the scientific thought of to-day has transcended this dualism. We now think of matter as essentially energetic. According to this later view, then, the Uniformity of Nature must subsist in the permanent self-identity of physical things, or at least of physical units, and in the unvarying correspondence, already indicated, between cause and effect. There is, however, no need to make separate mention of this correspondence, as though it were a second and independent ground of subsistence, for all that it contributes to the idea of Uniformity is sufficiently secured by the new conception that physical things have severally an energetic nature which is constitutive of their physical reality. That nature is partly disclosed to us in certain defined or (theoretically) definable capacities for action and reaction. The nature of a given thing *a* is such that in given conditions *b* it acts or reacts in a definite manner which we

describe as qualitatively *c*, and as quantitatively *d*. So long as *a* is *a* this capacity for action (or reaction) remains unaltered. Therefore, whenever we find *a* conditioned by *b*, then and there we also find the definite result *cd*—precisely correspondent, both qualitatively and quantitatively, to the conditions *b*. We conclude, therefore, that the Uniformity of Nature subsists in the permanent self-identity of physical things, and only therein.

As thus defined, then, the conception of Uniformity goes beyond the proposition of complete self-identity—*A* is *A*—only through the predicate of permanence. But this predicate is an essential presupposition of scientific method. Without this presupposition we could attribute to the particulars of the world only the merely factual existence disclosed in present experience. Indeed, without this supplementary postulate we could not reach either the conception of Nature or the scientific conception of a 'thing.' Our unit would be the given content of a psychological moment; the world of physical reality would be only an ever-changing panorama of mere phenomena; and the 'Laws of Nature' would be only a summary of past experience, only a statement of observed co-existences and sequences from which no inference would be possible. In such a world scientific prediction would be impossible, and experiment, though possible, unfruitful. The forecasts of Natural Science are always inferences, and inference is possible only within a world of permanent relations, only from particulars which severally possess a permanent nature. Experiment, too—although it could be curiously made in chaos—can be practically serviceable only within a perduring and systematic order. In a world of mere impermanence—were such a world possible—there could be neither induction nor scientific inquiry.

But the supplementary idea of permanence brings us once more to the verge of polemics. The permanence of the natural order is not a *datum* of immediate experience, nor can we say, if we are careful to speak accurately, that we reach the conception of it by inference from the observed course of natural 'becoming.' Our belief in the Uniformity of Nature is, doubtless, confirmed by the success of scientific

prediction, but the experimental and logical processes implied by such prediction presuppose uniformity as their postulate. The Uniformity of Nature—the permanence of natural things—is a necessary presupposition of the ‘scientific method.’ Now, what precisely do we mean by the permanence of natural things? We mean that the constitutive nature of things is a perduring nature—that Nature itself, as a systematic order of inter-related things, perdures without change *ab externo*, and that each particular thing continues to be what it is known to be unless and until the natural sequence of physical events brings it into new relations which give it a new empirical character—which induce in it, or have as their correlate, new modes of action or reaction. The Uniformity of Nature does *not* imply that Nature is a self-acting system independent and completely self-sufficing. It is perfectly consistent with the belief that Nature is dependent upon God and follows the determinations of His Will, provided only those determinations be thought of as permanent; but it is inconsistent with belief in miracles, with the belief that Nature is dependent upon a Will which is occasionally intervening and interrupting.

Is, then, our Christian belief in the miraculous any longer reasonable?

Let us begin with a definition. We mean by ‘the miraculous’ that which results from what is ordinarily called Divine interposition, from some special determination of God’s Will to an end not secured by those determinations of His Will which sustain and direct the ordinary processes of Nature. Some events that are usually called miraculous may be manifestations of a ‘higher law’ not yet discovered by physical research, and others may immediately point only to unsuspected powers in human nature, but with neither of these have we here and now any concern. The question before us relates only to that small group of events which, according to the general belief of Christendom, can be explained only by direct and special operations of the Divine Will. Let us, then, re-formulate the question in the light of this definition. Is it any longer reasonable to believe that the Will of God has sometimes been specially

and directly determined to an end not secured by those perduring determinations of His Will which sustain and direct the ordinary processes of Nature ?

As thus re-formulated the question does not seem very formidable. It may, perhaps, be said that it presupposes, without proof and without discussion, the Theistic construction of Reality. It does ; but, as we have already seen, the doctrine that Nature is dependent upon the Will of God is not in any way inconsistent with the scientific conception of Uniformity, if only we suppose, as some have supposed, the determinations of that Will to be permanent. It is not the time to argue the general question of Theism. According to all the schools of thought which are practically relevant to our modern Apologetics—according even to Professor Haeckel's Scientific Monism—the Nature that we know is dependent upon something : in other words, has a non-manifest ground of being, or *ratio essendi*. Christians interpret that ground theistically, and in so doing they no more contradict the 'Law of Uniformity' than do those who are content to speak of the Absolute or of Infinite and Eternal Substance. Contradiction arises only when they go on to allege Divine intervention, and the question consequent upon this contradiction cannot be other than this very simple one—'Has the alleged intervention actually occurred ?' Now, no one supposes the Will of God to be a blind activity ; no one supposes it to be other than teleological—*i.e.* determined by ends, even as our human wills are determined. Therefore, the very first stage in our discussion of the question 'Has God intervened ?' naturally leads to a re-statement of the question in the form already given—'Is it any longer reasonable to believe that the Will of God has sometimes been specially and directly determined to an end not secured by those perduring determinations of His Will which sustain and direct the ordinary processes of Nature ?'

Once more, then, this question does not seem very formidable. We know at least one end which is not secured, or not effectively secured, by that familiar disclosure of Reality given in 'the ordinary processes of Nature,' and that end is not only of primary importance to us, but is also one

that we can reasonably believe to be valuable to God. Nature does not and cannot tell us whether our moral ideals are 'objectively' valid. In fact, Nature sometimes seems to write a harsh negation of those ideals; and yet we continue to believe in them and to make them sovereign in the practical conduct of life. But herein we are only adventurers of faith. We do not know, we can only trust; and sometimes the adverse comment of Circumstance breaks down our trust, and leaves us hopelessly facing an irresponsible world that hurries heedlessly 'down the ringing grooves of change' to ultimate death. Has Nature a moral end? Are the ends which seem sovereign in our individual lives also ends for that larger order of Reality in which those lives seem integral?—these are questions of primary importance to us men, nor, if God exist, can we suppose Him indifferent to them, or to our interest in them. To suppose Him indifferent would, for many of us, be inconsistent with the very bases of our Theism.

We reach our belief in God principally, if not only, by inference or supposition from the essential facts of our spiritual nature and our moral endeavour. Our life is characteristically governed by ideals which—implicitly, at least—are presupposed by all our activity. These ideals are not imposed upon us from without; they have their ground in the capacity and potency of our own nature, and, in so far as they rest upon potency, they are ideals of perfection, and set forth their supporting potency as completely actual. They are regulative of life because they do but disclose the constitutive character of our dynamic and developing nature. As thus regulative they are 'subjectively' valid; they claim to be also 'objectively' valid, but this further validity is not evident, and we derive it from God, in Whom we believe because of the unique magistracy of those ideals, and Whose creative and sovereign Will has, we believe, 'from before the foundation of the world' reconciled in one consummating purpose the orders which we now distinguish as theoretical and practical, natural and ethical. If, then, God be thus the ultimate source of our ideals, and His loving Will the pledge of their validity, it is impossible to suppose Him indifferent

to the primary human interests connected with those ideals, to the needs that arise out of the seeming contrast between the vocation to which they determine us and the natural order within which, if anywhere, that vocation has to be followed.

Therefore, when we, who thus believe, are asked, 'Is it reasonable to think that God has intervened?' we reply 'It were, for us, unreasonable to think that He has not, because the very indications that lead us to affirm His existence lead us to attribute to Him an end which is not otherwise secured, and probably could not otherwise be secured.'

The question, 'Are our moral ideals "objectively" valid?' is one that is not answered by any of our secular disciplines—by Science, History, or Philosophy. It can be answered only by a sufficient disclosure of the ultimate nature of Reality; but that nature, as we all know, is not manifest in the world's secular order, and whatever the results we reach by inference or supposition from the facts of that order, these results have no more than an hypothetical validity. Only by some *special* disclosure of Reality can our question be answered. Therefore, if our theistic interpretation of experience be correct, an answer can come only from God, can come only from some exceptional manifestation of His Nature directly determined to our need. In other words, an answer can come to us only by revelation, and if it come, the answering revelation must be mediated by miracle.

Nor is this conception of an intervening God in any way or in the least degree unworthy of the majesty of the Most High. We are sometimes told that the conception of a miracle-working God is spiritually inferior to that of One who completely accomplishes all His purposes by unvarying law. But suppose it impossible that the ends subserved by miracle could be subserved by law? Then, miracles would not detract from the greatness of God; they would glorify His greatness by illustrating His love. Nor would this supposition be gratuitous. The moral ideal is an ideal of manhood made perfect in and through the life of love. Believing in God, we believe that this ideal comes from Him, and expresses His purpose for our lives. Therefore, manhood in this way made



complete is a proximate end of God's purpose in creation. But could this end be attained in a world (were such a world possible) whose obvious processes and course entirely satisfied our every need and met our every aspiration with sufficing opportunity—where no defect of knowledge made room for trust, where no discrepancy between the natural and the spiritual loosened our affection from the things of earth, and quickened our faith to lay hold of an unseen Fatherhood? It does not seem so. In such a world *Gnosis* would be greater than Charity, and if there were there a State Church it would probably be Epicurean.

It is sometimes said that if once we admit the possibility of miracles we destroy the certainty of scientific prediction. Upon this we need make only very brief comment. Although we certainly believe that miracles are always possible—for God's transcendent power is infinite—we also believe that they have in fact been infrequent. The revelation given in the Incarnate Life was 'full, perfect, and sufficient,' and we have no *a priori* reason for thinking any supplement necessary. If it be said that miracles occur to-day, we have little or no apologetic interest in the statement.<sup>1</sup>

The 'law of uniformity' is, at the best, only probably, not demonstratively, true. It is a postulate which we find practically useful, and we need not to-day trust it less if we are led to believe that some 1900 years ago, for a purpose not likely to recur, water was miraculously turned into wine at Cana in Galilee.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sacramental grace is clearly supernatural, but it does not seem to be miraculous, or to be attended by miracle.

<sup>2</sup> At the highest possible valuation the 'law of uniformity' seems to be only a presentation, within the physical categories, of a more fundamental conception, that of the rationality of the world, which is the presupposition of all theory and practice. But, obviously, because the 'law of uniformity' is thus provincial, it does not and cannot adequately express the rational nature of a 'world' which fills all categories. The 'law of uniformity,' by itself, enables us to say only that inference is possible. Belief in the miraculous lifts the idea of rationality to a higher place, by giving prominence to the thought of moral purpose. Probably the ultimate expression for the Uniformity of Nature would immediately set forth not a physical rule but a spiritual end—an end from which, did we know enough, we could deduce the rule as ancillary.



## VI.

For those, then, who believe in God and in the serious reality of man's moral vocation, every antecedent probability is convincingly on the side of miracles. But after all this has been said, and rightly said, the historical question remains, 'Have miracles, in fact, occurred?'

The question is one that the Christian Church cannot ignore, or treat as of only secondary importance. Christianity is more than an ethical teaching and discipline; it is a revelation of ultimate Reality—not of its substantial essence, but of its essential nature and sovereign character. It is not only preceptual, it is evidential and demonstrative; and that to which it bears witness, that which it demonstrates, is none other than the character of God—the essential nature of existent Reality. In its immediate incidence upon the hearts of men it is a message of salvation and a doctrine of conduct; but its salvation is complete, and its doctrine valid, because it is a revelation, because its characteristic content of thought faithfully sets forth the ultimate truth of things, because its characteristic mission and vocation faithfully express the sovereign purpose of the world.

And this would not be if Christianity were nothing but a creation of the human heart and mind. It is what it is, and does what it does, only in virtue of its Divine origin and nature—only in virtue of its miraculous foundation and credentials. It is more than a declaration of truth, it is a certified declaration: and it derives its unique character and potency not solely from the truth it declares, but also from the evangelical credentials which mediate its message, and commend that message to the waiting hearts of men. Our religious trust has its proximate ground not in doctrine but in events that corroborate doctrine—not in the words of our Lord, but in His Nature and His continuous ministry of grace.

Words, even when true, appeal only to human thought and hope. At the most they disclose a gracious possibility, a possibility fenced off from certainty by everything which makes the world seem other than anthropocentric, by every-

thing that makes philosophy doubtful, and imposes modesty upon our interpretations. Is it indeed true that our human thought can adequately discover, or our human hope attain, the ultimate truth of things? We do not know. Somewhat of practical mastery over the world is certainly ours; but, beyond the region wherein experiment yields verifying results, there is an infinite expanse wherein experiment can never be complete, nor inference be more than hypothetical, and into that infinity our deepest and most characteristic needs daily compel us to adventure.

Were man entirely of the earth, earthy—innocent of speculation, untroubled by ideals, he might find sufficing content in the meat which perisheth, and in the industry whereby he wins that meat. But the spirit of man is not thus easily satisfied. That spirit is characteristically a developing potency, and its yet imperfect powers—actual, but incompletely actual—find expression in ideals of being and doing which seem sovereign, and determine his endeavour and his hope towards a life more perfect, an achievement more complete, than anything which he has yet reached. Are those ideals valid? Is the highest interest of his life a delusion or a prophetic inspiration? Once more, we do not know. Experience often seems adverse, and at the best can be favourably construed only if we make assumptions which we cannot verify. We use our thought with intrepid earnestness and subtle care; but our thought, as we immediately know it, is a transient incident in a world which our best skill leaves incomprehensible—a world whose empirically-given character suggests a nature radically alien from our own. It may be that Philosophy overcomes this apparent 'otherness' of the world; but Philosophy is a human thought, and cannot escape the uncertainty which constantly besets us whenever our thought becomes metaphysical. We *hope* that we are not mistaken, but hope is not knowledge. It illustrates the strength of human aspiration and the native optimism of the human heart. It does not illuminate the world which it prompts us to construe favourably.

Because the world which immediately conditions man's life is patent to observation, his ordinary disposition is to walk

by sight and to assign primary value and normal character to the content (or disclosures) of his sensory experience, and, in fact, the knowledge he receives in that experience supplies his primary and most urgent needs. He can maintain himself in the world without becoming consciously metaphysical—without looking beyond the seemingly immediately given things of his physical environment. But the maintenance thus won was sufficient for only certain of his needs. 'Man doth not live by bread alone,' and, although the need for 'bread' be primary and sometimes absorbing, his nature contains possibilities which are not expressed in that need, nor satisfied by the things that satisfy it. Man's nature is not merely animal; it is distinctly ethical, and the ethical, if allowed free utterance and full opportunity, will always claim sovereignty in the world of created existence, and always use the animal and physical as subordinate and ancillary. How far back in history this transcendent potency became operative we do not know. It was present, undoubtedly, in the first beginnings of history, for it is original in human nature—an underived constituent in man's essential being—and wherever it may be present we can never think of it as quite inactive. It was present even in those far-off days when rude hunters rudely shaped the Eolithic flints, and even then—effective, though inarticulate—it was probably passing from potency into act, preparing needs which no human achievement would be able to satisfy, shaping rude natures towards ends that no boldness of endeavour would attain. In the fulness of time those ends became apparent, those needs urgent, and now, in the world's best life, they are sovereign. To them industry is slowly becoming subordinate, and politics instrumental. Man's ethical vocation has become articulate, and in following it he is content to hold worthless much that he aforesaid prized, and to forego satisfactions which are close at hand for the sake of distant enterprise towards an undiscovered goal. The thought of Right, the ideal of Charity—these, because grounded upon potencies which claim an intrinsic sovereignty, are to-day passing on to an unlimited *imperium*, and history is receiving an explicit determination to ends that no 'naturalism' can justify, and

that even common-sense often deems imprudent. Over and above all our endeavour after the world's proximate and practical good, hovers the benedictory conception of another good which consists not in *possessing* but in *being*—a good which contradicts many a calculation of the market-place and invites us from many a false opportunity for pleasure; and to that other and higher good we are content to consecrate ourselves. But is this more than an idiosyncrasy of temperament—a passing incident of evolution—quixotic chivalry to a dream? Is the sacrifice of immediate gain for the sake of things that 'eye hath not seen, nor ear heard,' the venture of a reasonable faith, or only a visionary extravagance?<sup>1</sup>

These questions are not only speculative, they are practical; for, if the imperative of goodness have only a psychological ground, it must take its chance with the secular changes of human temperament, and may at any time be set aside by the dictates of worldly prudence. Only if the good life be reasonable can it be missionary without impertinence; only if it be reasonable can it maintain itself against the world's lower interests and ignobler policies. If Reality be not essentially ethical, then is our faith vain.

Once more, these questions are not only speculative, they are also practical. Indeed, in their appeal to human interest they are primarily practical. They are fundamental, not only for morality and religion, but for every form of human practice which is in any degree impressed by ethical feeling, or influenced by ethical ends. All these presuppose the ultimate righteousness of the world—presuppose that the world-order is not only rational but moral. This presupposition, however, lies beyond the disclosures of secular history and the discoveries of science, and can receive only hypothetical demonstration from philosophy. Now, it is precisely this presupposition that our Christian faith most persuasively confirms. Indeed, we may say that the ultimate philosophical

<sup>1</sup> In modern philosophy these questions are at the root of our discussions concerning the relation of the Practical to the Speculative Reason, of the Moral to the Natural Order, of pragmatic constructions to ultimate Reality.

value of Christianity is to be found in that confirmation. God became man to manifest His Fatherhood, and by that manifestation the world's highest faith is vindicated, the world's noblest ideals verified. By 'the taking of the Manhood into God' we were taught, once for all—in a manner 'full, perfect, and sufficient'—that man is not alien to ultimate Reality; for, while remaining 'perfect Man,' he can become organic to that Reality and co-efficient with it.<sup>1</sup>

But the Hypostatic Union illuminates the character of God as well as the nature of man. Not without self-abnegation did the Word become flesh. 'Being in the form of God,' He emptied Himself, and became in all points like as we are, yet without sin. And, in His voluntary humiliation to the conditions of mortal life, He 'became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross.' We do not know the method of this Incarnation—we cannot surmise in what way 'God and Man is one Christ,' nor profitably discuss how the cosmic Word can be the historical Christ, how He 'in Whom all things consist' can, while still 'upholding all things by the word of His power,' be personally incarnate; but fortunately these subtle questionings of over-curious thought, although not unimportant, are only remotely and tenuously important. For the practical needs of our faith it is sufficient that, because 'God so loved the world,' man has, in very deed, beheld the glory of the Incarnate, 'full of grace and truth.'

'Because God so loved the world'—Christianity is the historical exhibition of that love; not merely a declaration of it, but an actual manifestation of it within the world-process. It is the Divine response to our otherwise unanswered questionings, and the response is sufficient, for what more can we want than to know that God—the ultimate and sovereign Reality—is indeed Love, and not Irony?

From its ground in an historical revelation, mediated through a miraculous Person, Christianity derives its distinctive and unique character; in virtue of this ground it does its distinctive and unique work. The purpose of that revelation was to manifest the love of God and to commend

<sup>1</sup> 'Perfect God, and perfect Man: of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting.'

that love to human hearts. The fundamental conception in Christian thought is that of the Divine Fatherhood, but it involves radical misunderstanding to suppose that Christianity is founded upon this conception, or that acceptance of this conception is sufficient to constitute Christian discipleship. Christianity has its ground in, and derives its primary *credenda* from, a miraculous order in history. That order manifests, and was intended to manifest, the love of God for a world which could find rest only in His love. The Christian religion is the practical apparatus whereby that manifestation is made effective in the hearts and minds of men. If Christianity be separated from its ground in a miraculous history, it becomes—what? A pleasant opinion, and a rule of life which, when comfortably minimized, some of us find agreeable. It remains a revelation indeed, but a revelation of man not of God. It sets forth man's perennial aspiration and unconquerable hope, but it leaves the unchanging heavens unresponsive.

(a) We call the foundation of our Faith miraculous because the Incarnation, although an event within the historical order, is not part of the natural sequence which constitutes that order. Some—whose conception of order has room only for the commonplace—attempt to overcome the 'separateness' which thus exists between the Incarnate Word and His historical environment by means of Neo-Kantian or Hegelian thought. If Neo-Kantian, they start with epistemology—with an analysis of the act of knowing—and boldly carry their thought to the conclusion that the subject of and in each individual experience is a 'reproduction' of an Eternal Self-Consciousness. If Hegelian, they employ a dialectic which sets forth all finite existents as partial expressions or aspects of an Absolute which they construe theologically. In one or other of these ways they conclude that every man participates in the Divine Nature; that God is incarnate in each individual, because the substantial reality of each individual is Divine; that the Incarnation of the Word does but illustrate a perpetual process and a universal fact. Thus they avoid the thought of intervention. They give prominence to the Divine factors in history, but

because those factors are, *ex hypothesi*, essential constituents in *all* history, their presence in the Person of Christ is not unique, and does not burden Christian thought with the conception of the miraculous.

It were easy to criticize this theological adventure philosophically—to shew, for instance, (1) that the Neo-Kantian transition from epistemology to cosmology—at least, as illustrated by Green's advance from the 'spiritual principle in knowledge' to the 'spiritual principle in Nature'—is an unreasoned transition, an advance *per saltum*, and not by inference; and (2) that the dialectic which leads us to the conception of the Absolute does not compel us to interpret the relation between the Absolute and finite particulars as a relation between 'whole and part,' essence and manifestation, Reality and 'appearance.' It seems, however, more directly pertinent to point out (a) that this new Christology is not the Christology of the Creeds; and (β) that, if the Nature of our Lord be so construed as to appear non-miraculous, it cannot possess either the meaning or the religious value which we who stand in other ways of thought believe it to possess.

(a) According to the traditional theology of the Church the Person of Christ is unique. 'Perfect God and perfect Man,' He joins two natures in the sempiternal bands of an incomparable Personality. But neither Neo-Kantian nor Hegelian thought can account for more than one nature in our Lord, and that a nature essentially similar to our own. The Christ of contemporary idealism can be no more than monophysite, and differs from us only in capacity, not in essence. According to that doctrine we are all 'reproductions' of the Supreme Self-Consciousness—forms, parts, manifestations, appearances of the Absolute—and our Lord is nothing more. One essence is common to Him and to us, and His nature is generically identical with our own. *Ex hypothesi*, there was not, in the Incarnation, any assumption of manhood into God, but only the submission of 'God'—of the Absolute—to the conditions of human existence: something dangerously like 'conversion of the Godhead into flesh'; something also which, according to the philosophical doctrines we are considering, has taken place in every human birth.



*Ex hypothesi*, the process which constitutes the Person of Christ is the same as that which constitutes human personality. In Christ, as in man, we have Ultimate Reality manifested in the form of human nature, and subject to the conditions of human experience. We may hesitate to call the result Unitarian, but if we do so it is only because Unitarianism, in its older and better known forms, ordinarily assumed an ultimate difference of essence between God and all finite particulars, whereas the new theology of idealism teaches an identity of essence. It permits us to say—if we use philosophy with theological inaccuracy—that Christ is God, but only because it permits us to say the same, in the same sense, of each individual man. But the more modern Unitarianism is Neo-Kantian or Hegelian, and with this the Christology we are considering appears to be identical. We are not concerned, at this point, to discuss the truth of this Christology, but only to point out its departure from traditional standards, and that, be it true or be it false, it is not the Christology of the Fathers and Doctors—not the Christology of the Catholic Church.

This destructive approximation to Unitarianism can be avoided only by saying that the world-process which reproduces or incarnates Reality in each one of us made Christ more real than we are,—only by saying that in Christ Reality is more completely expressed and more fully embodied than in us. We might thus re-affirm the 'separateness' of Christ, and continue to speak of His unique character, though not of His unique personality. He would be more than man, because more completely real, and in this sense He would be unique. But the difference between Him and men would be one of degree, not of kind, and His personality would formally be identical with ours. His and ours alike would be constituted by what Du Prel called 'dramatic sunderings of the Absolute,'—by the self-limitation of the Absolute to the conditions of our individual experience. Moreover, He, like us, would be monophysite. His personality would not rest upon or express the hypostatic union of two natures.

A personality even in this way unique would, however, to both Neo-Kantian and Hegelian thought, be an irreducible

surd—an incident in the world-process which the dialectic of that process could not explain. That dialectic is essentially a dialectic of orderly, of rational, becoming. Its movement is throughout logical: its every advance is logically conditioned, and its every stage logically consequent. It can neither provide for nor explain the sudden appearance of a unique personality. Such a personality would be outside the dialectic movement of the world-process. It would arise out of some special determination of the Absolute, and would be as truly miraculous as the Hypostatic Union.

We conclude, therefore, that the Christology of contemporary idealism can avoid the miraculous only by ignoring the unique personality of our Lord, or by destroying belief in it. Individual theologians who follow this way of thought may, it is true, recognize in Him a certain 'separateness' of nature, but that 'separateness' is not the 'separateness' taught by the Catholic Faith, it cannot be established or explained by the philosophy used to illustrate it, and it re-introduces the very conception which these theologians wish to be rid of—the conception of the miraculous.

( $\beta$ ) Because our Lord is perfect God and perfect Man, His Person is unique, not only in significance, but also in religious value. Can the new Christology preserve that significance and value unimpaired? We think not. The speculative, the cosmological significance of our Lord's Person is what it is because of His essential Nature. He, being substantially very God, has assumed Manhood, and this assumption is the theological and historical ground of Christian optimism—it is our warrant for a certain cosmological theory of the greatest practical importance. This cosmological significance of the Person of our Lord has its ground, not in His doctrine or in His ethical character, but in His Nature. It results, not from the Sermon on the Mount, but from the Hypostatic Union. If that Union be denied or ignored, then whatever be the residuary or alternative significance of our Lord's Person, *that* particular significance vanishes.

Suppose our Lord to be only one among many reproductions of the Eternal Self-Consciousness, one among many individual manifestations of the Absolute—His personality

can have no more significance than man's. If we can infer optimism by means of Neo-Kantian or Hegelian pantheism, the inference is as certain from ourselves as from Christ, because, *ex hypothesi*, its ground is not in something uniquely present in Christ, but in the world-process which is constitutive of all individual existents—of this man, A, and that man, B, no less than of Christ.

According to Catholic theology, our Lord, in virtue of His unique personality, does for man what man cannot do for himself. According to the 'theologies of re-statement' the cosmological conceptions illustrated by the Person of Christ have an equally sufficient ground in the nature of each one of us. This, if true, would entail important religious consequences. Our Lord, in virtue of His unique personality, holds a unique place in the Universe of Existence, and His religious value—as the Way, the Truth, and the Life—because immediately dependent upon that unique nature and position, and upon that alone, is also unique. In virtue of His unique nature and position, He uniquely discloses the nature of Ultimate Reality, and places man in uniquely helpful relations thereto. This constitutes His religious value, and makes His nature and work permanently fundamental to the Christian religion. Because of all this He is the permanent term of Christian faith and our lives are uniquely dependent upon Him. But if it be true that the Person of Christ is not unique, nor of unique cosmological significance—if it be true that human personality, as it exists in each one of us, is similar in constitution, and therefore similar in significance—then the centre of religious interest will inevitably shift. Each man will become sufficient unto himself because of the metaphysical implications of his nature, and Christ will, at the most, have only a provisional work to do in making those implications apparent. The Christian, like the Vedāntist, will find the verification of his faith in himself, and would reach it when he could repeat as his own the ultimate expression of Vedāntist triumph—'I am That One.' The Person and work of our Lord, the ministry and witness of the Church's corporate life—these might continue to possess a certain preliminary and provisional usefulness in preparing

men for that ultimate self-confidence, but they would be only pedagogues to bring man to himself, and when they had done their work effectually the Gnostic would rise above them into a known or felt, or known and felt, oneness with the Supreme ; and in *that* and not in them would be the ground of his faith. A religion thus operative would be widely aberrant from the norm of Christian life and faith. It would not be the Christianity wherein we now live ; it would, indeed, if Christian at all, be that only temporarily and in a secondary sense.

But can one in fact infer optimism from the idealist conception of human nature ? We think not. Green's transition from the 'spiritual principle in knowledge' to the 'spiritual principle in Nature' is only doubtfully valid, and, were it valid, what reason could we derive from the *Prolegomena to Ethics* for asserting that human ends are cosmic ends—that the ends apparently sovereign for this or that individual 'reproduction' of the Eternal Self-Consciousness are ends, and sovereign ends, for that 'spiritual principle in Nature' which is other than any or all of its 'reproductions' ? How could Green shew that these ends, as they exist in man, are not mere 'appearance,' which indicates primarily only the disabling limitations of endeavour and outlook caused by the self-limitation of the Eternal to the conditions of individual experience ? How could he shew that the pessimist's renunciation of life is not the true gospel, and that the relapse of the individual into an Ultimate Life untroubled by ideals is not the true *summum bonum* ?

As to Hegelianism : can its dialectic prove that our ideals survive the transition from the 'temporal' to the 'eternal'—that they are more than evolutionary incidents in a life which will one day pass beyond them into an indescribable completeness where will be no place for them, or wherein they will be transformed out of all recognition ?

These speculative idealisms would leave the practical idealism of human nature and of man's every-day life precisely what the world's sympathetic common-sense reports it to be—a doubtful aspiration and an uncertain hope ; and, if we permit our thought of Christ to be fashioned by the

theology which misuses those disciplines, we shall not find in His Nature anything to dispel that doubt or to make that hope sure and certain. As a consequence, we shall no longer be able to find in Him any religious value. That value is given only by a certain instrumental efficiency—by ministry to human needs, and characteristically to those needs which directly relate man to Ultimate Reality and presuppose, unless they be misleading, an effectual kindness therein. The Incarnate Word, consubstantial with God and man, has that efficiency, because thus consubstantial; but, if He were God Incarnate only in virtue of a world-process of 'reproduction' or manifestation similarly operative in constituting human personality, He could not thus help us. He might, by the psychological effects of His character and life, increase our faith and strengthen our hope, but He would confirm neither. He might quicken or refresh the immanent idealism of our lives, but He would not and could not verify it.<sup>1</sup> Therefore He would not have religious value, and with this thought we conclude our examination of Neo-Kantian and Hegelian Christianity.

(b) We have said that the Christian religion has its ultimate ground in a miraculous history. Therefore, when we affirm the Christian *credenda* we understand ourselves to be declaring the essential particulars of that history. To us the Creeds are historical, not only because they are creations of history, but because they narrate history—because they set forth events, and make plain the essential character of those events. To us, therefore, the question 'Did these things which you affirm as events actually happen, and, if they happened, did they in fact possess the character you attribute to them?' is of essential importance.

There are some, however, to whom the Creeds are not, in this full sense, historical. For instance, according to Ritschlian theologians, they are 'valuations' rather than narrations. The characteristic judgement of Ritschlian

<sup>1</sup> It were easy to conceive a philosophy—pragmatist or allied to pragmatism—that would find religious value in this emotional invigoration, but the religious value would be attributable directly to the increased faith and strengthened hope, not to the Person of Christ.

thought is not the judgement of existence or essence—'Christ is God,'—but the 'judgement of value'—'Christ has for us the religious value of God.' According to Ritschl and his successors, the ground of Christian Faith is in a present experience, and the Christian *credenda* express values known and felt in that experience.

Is this transition from past history to present value valid, and, if it be valid, does it make secondary the history we believe to be fundamental, or permit us to 'naturalize' it without loss to faith?

Now, it is undoubtedly true that our individual faith rests upon personal experience; that Christian faith is the correlate of Christian life—but is that present experience equally the ground of the Christian religion? We cannot think so. It is true that our faith gives living efficacy to the Christian *credenda*, but it does not constitute objects of Christian faith. It is true also that the affirmations of our faith will become sincere, and the presentations of our faith vivid, in proportion as our Christian experience becomes deep and rich; but that experience is a mode of apprehension, and does not create the verities our faith affirms. In Christian experience we are in contact with the Christian order of historical reality, but that experience does not constitute that order. It gives content to our faith, but does not create the objects of our faith. *These* are independently given, and our experience is only a way of approach to them. Ritschlianism illuminates the psychological ground of our religious affirmations, but it can explain the content of those affirmations only by presupposing the Evangelical history. That history is known to us as the background of a valuable and valuating experience, and our faith is the correlate of the value therein known and valued as *given* to that experience, not derived from it or constituted by it. Ritschlianism is, in fact, a valuable contribution to Christian *Erkenntniss-Theorie*. If it seem to be more, it is only because its actual presupposition of the Christian foundations in history—clearly apparent in Ritschl's own work—is allowed to remain merely a tacit supposition.

And presupposition of this kind is necessary if judgements

of value are to have more than psychological significance. If there be no such presupposition, then, instead of the judgement 'This thing, A, has this value, B,' we can have only the judgement, 'This valuable feeling, B, exists,' and such a judgement would denote only a psychological incident—it would not be a characterization of non-psychological reality. We can affirm that Christ has for us the religious value of God only if Christ be factually given. He is not so given in the experience which, *ex hypothesi*, declares His value. Therefore, unless He be otherwise given, and that other presentation be presupposed, the Ritschlian value-judgement concerning Him would be impossible. Unless felt worth be the worth of an object, A, it cannot help us to characterize A.

And, in fact, Ritschlianism does presuppose its objects. Its values are not merely psychological: they are values of things, and because thus related—and only because thus related—they help us to characterize their principiants. The Ritschlian affirms the Godhead of Christ in virtue of a certain experience of value, but that experience is not a mere feeling. It is, *ex hypothesi*, an experience of the *value of Christ*, and only because it is this can it help to characterize Christ. It would seem, therefore, that Ritschlianism does not enable us to dispense with Christian history, or make that history less important.

Ritschlianism, however, is so complex a movement that it is not easy to say precisely how much a given theologian of the Ritschlian school actually presupposes. Ritschl himself based his thought upon the Synoptic Gospels, but there are in his writings highly significant and interesting passages in which he includes the experience of the Apostolic age and of the Christian society among fundamentals. But it is certain that he did not accept these in any sense that implied an acceptance of Nicene 'metaphysics.' Indeed, his professed, perhaps his primary, aim was to rid Christian theology of 'metaphysics.' Profoundly influenced by Kant, although not in permanent and exclusive discipleship to him, he had no place in his system of thought for the miraculous, and no potency in his logic for metempirical characterization. There-



fore, when he affirmed the Godhead of Christ, he affirmed not a metempirical nature but a certain practical and experienced value. In his hands the judgement of value was not merely a judgement determined by value, but a judgement in terms of value—not in terms of essence. But an experienced value, unless it indicate essence, does not indicate religious worth in the person who is its principiant. If Christ has for us the religious value of God it is only because He is essentially God. But Ritschl's philosophy left essence an unexplored and unexplorable 'thing-in-itself.' Therefore his Christ, because not 'very God of very God,' has not the religious value of God.

We conclude, then, once more, that Christianity cannot be detached from its foundations in a miraculous history without losing its distinctly religious value—without losing its distinctive character as true religion.

(c) Ritschlianism, although it has found many Nonconformist sympathizers, has not yet made any considerable impression within the Church of England. Dr. Percy Gardner, however, has propounded a doctrine of religion which, although not Ritschlian, has interesting affinities with Ritschlianism. 'A permanent basis for doctrine,' he tells us, 'can only be found in historic facts, the evidence for which is beyond question, the realities of the permanent life of the spirit.' Stated in more general terms, his aim is 'to transfer the burden of support of Christian doctrine from history to psychology.'

Dr. Gardner, we have said, is not a Ritschlian. His philosophical foundations are in the Kantian phenomenalism of Lipsius. We naturally expect, therefore, that his psychology will be pure psychology, untainted by that presupposition of certain non-psychological facts which is so often found in Ritschlianism. And it is evident that Dr. Gardner intends to fulfil this expectation.

But can psychological facts—if taken in their purely psychological character as facts of the inner life—be translated or developed into Christian theology? We think not. Those facts are theologically neutral. They are common to all forms of religious experience. If they receive a Christian

meaning, they receive it, not from their psychological content, but from the non-psychological order of Christian history. Christian experience—the experience of Christian believers within the Christian society—is, undoubtedly, the immediate and psychological ground of Christian belief, and Christian belief, if it be more than theoretical, must always rest upon this ground. But it is not the only ground of Christian belief, nor does it become such a ground in virtue only of its merely psychological content. It becomes a ground of Christian belief only when interpreted in the light of Christian history. The psychological foundations of Christian faith are co-efficient with the non-psychological order of Christian history. Apart from that order, these foundations are not distinctively Christian. Christian faith rests, therefore, not upon experience as purely psychological, but upon *interpreted* experience.

And when we turn to Dr. Gardner's work we find, inconsistently enough with his declared theory, that interpretation is, in fact, present in his 'psychological' foundations. According to Dr. Gardner, the 'great and essential doctrines which lie at the roots of all soteriologic doctrines are three: First, that man has a natural sense of sin. . . . Second, that the load of sin can only be removed by a change of heart. . . . Third, that no man by his own strivings can bring about this change, but that it is wrought in him, not in defiance of his own will, but by a kind of absorption of it by a higher Power.' But what are we to understand by 'absorption'? Is it purely and simply a given fact of experience, or is it the interpretation of a fact? If the latter, Dr. Gardner has at the foundation of his thought, not a psychological *fact*, but an inference.

How, according to Dr. Gardner, is this higher Power known to us? The answer is given in *Exploratio Evangelica* (p. 12):

'In the inner world there is also a fundamental contrast, that between the soul and God, between our will and a higher will, between what is and what ought to be. In consciousness we learn to recognize the presence of a Power as much greater than our soul as the forces of the material world are greater than the forces

of our bodies. This Power has been spoken of in many ways. In a loyal adhesion to this Power the spiritual life consists. It is the study of our relations with this Power which makes up our religious knowledge.'

We cannot here discuss the very interesting question — 'What is the content of religious consciousness? Our own opinion is that the religious consciousness is never cognitive, except of psychological facts. There is much in religious experience to induce or confirm belief in God, but probably there is never, in that experience, any immediate presentation of Him to the knowing subject as a given fact.

The higher Power which Dr. Gardner finds in religious experience is found by him there because he first of all puts it there by an act of interpretation, and this interpretation is either a venture of Faith, which itself needs to be confirmed, or is the result of lessons learnt from 'historical,' not from purely 'psychological' religion.

We conclude, therefore, yet again, that Christian history is an essential constituent in the foundations of Christian belief.

(To be continued.)

---

#### ART. II.—THE SPIRITUAL CARE OF INVALIDS.

1. *Pastoral Visitation.* By Rev. H. E. SAVAGE, M.A. (London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1903.)
2. *Address by the Bishop of Birmingham at St. Philip's Church on St. Luke's Day.* (*The Guardian*, October 26, 1904.)
3. *The Force of Mind, or the Mental Factor in Medicine.* By A. T. SCHOFIELD, M.D. (J. and A. Churchill. 1902.)

THE visiting of the sick is generally recognized as one of the most important responsibilities of the parochial clergy; and though many of the younger men would be grateful for a larger measure of help and guidance, at least in the earlier years of their ministerial life, than they at present

receive, there is no reason to think that the duty is not, in most parishes, more or less adequately performed at any rate in regard to their poorer members. But here from a variety of causes, some of which we shall attempt to consider, the limit of pastoral opportunity and responsibility seems too often to have been reached. It is unfortunately still true to a large extent, as we felt compelled to urge in these pages twenty-six years ago, that the invalids of what are called the upper and middle classes 'have less done for their spiritual needs than almost any other set of people.'<sup>1</sup> And yet the question of the relation of the Church to such invalids is a pressing one; for, on the one hand, the increasing consideration of health and modern impatience of pain lead to an extraordinary extravagance and recklessness in pursuit of cures; and, on the other hand, the growing influence of Christian Science and mind-curing make havoc on all sides among unstable souls, who have drifted away for lack of the Church's hold on them. Their needs and difficulties are very great, and the clergy have been slow to realize them, and to understand their power to help such cases. While the material side of illness is being accentuated and specialized in every possible way, the spiritual side seems more and more ignored, and the deliberate exercise of prayer and faith to heal the sick, or bring the needed grace to sustain a life of suffering, is mainly left to those who reject all the teaching of Church and Sacraments. The object of this article is to ask once more that due consideration may be given to the subject of the systematic visiting of invalids.

On every side we see young invalids sinking into needless ill-health for want of self-control and courage—almost enjoying a restless round of treatments, climates, cures of every description; wasting hundreds of pounds in a year or two for the relief of ailments which, under due precautions, need not really interfere with an ordinary life, or breaking up home life and sacrificing the comfort of many for a doubtful gain to one member. Others have passed through that stage and have learnt that there is no escape from the cross, that

<sup>1</sup> *Spiritual Needs of Invalids*, C. Q. R., vol. ix., p. 141 (Oct. 1879).

it must be taken up, and borne unto the end ; and truly they need all that the Church can give to uphold them in faith and courage through a weary imprisonment or a life-long martyrdom, unlit by earthly hope. Again, the dying have to be succoured, sometimes in the acute phase of a short agony, when the lessons of a lifetime have to be interpreted in the light of death ; or others have to be helped through the long journey down the Valley of the Shadow, through the trying fluctuations and slow 'dying by inches' which in cases of organic disease may last for years.

The Bishop of Birmingham has reminded us that the Church has a distinct message and ministry to such. They may claim the ministry which our Prayer-Book appoints, and ask that the clergy should go to them in the name of Christ, as to members of His Church, with a definite purpose. In the address referred to at the head of our article the Bishop made an earnest appeal

'in the matter of healing to those who, as physicians and as nurses, were occupied about the bedsides of those seriously sick and dying, to allow its proper place to the ministry of religion, which had, he fancied, in recent years been almost crowded out from any real or intelligible part in ministering by the bedside of the dying. The minister of religion was not summoned, at any rate very often was not allowed to appear at the bedside of the dying, until, for all intelligent and intelligible purposes, it was too late, because the patient was no longer capable of entertaining serious thoughts. He earnestly asked that those who shared the responsibility in the control of sick-rooms should endeavour to procure some reform in this matter. There had been a great tendency to deal with sickness in its final and serious stages as if man were merely a body without a spirit ; and Christian society had been wandering to extravagances—for so they often were—in the way of faith-healing, as reaction and protest against an undue separation of what was legitimate and right. He believed with a most profound conviction that faith, with its quiet, calming power—the consciousness of peace with God, the expectation of Divine help, the faith in the power of prayer—had an effect far greater than merely material science had been accustomed to recognise in producing or maintaining a healthy body or physical life. He believed that faith-healing had at the bottom of it a real and legitimate witness against the one-sided materialism with which we had been

treating sickness ; and so he earnestly asked of those who were responsible for the control of the sick-bed to see to it that while the physician was allowed his own proper supremacy of direction, the minister of religion was allowed his own proper place in the ministry of prayer and Sacraments and the Word of God.'

The quiet steady teaching of regular visitation, the exercise of calm, prayerful, spiritual force, brought to bear with wisdom and understanding on weak, disordered bodies and undisciplined souls, with the authority of a divinely appointed ministry, would promote their fullest salvation ; and should nurses and doctors object to a clergyman's visit as 'depressing' for the patient, it could soon be proved that the visit, if rightly used, was likely to bring a distinct sense of help and peace which would benefit the sick person.

The clergy may feel that invalids are slow to avail themselves of such ministry, while an increasing number of invalids say, on their part, 'It is useless to ask for it ; we have tried in vain.' If the position of the sick in these cases could be more clearly understood, some misunderstandings might be removed, and a wider extension might be given of that spiritual help which is of unspeakable value and comfort to souls in adversity.

The primary difficulty seems to be that it is generally left to the invalid *to take the initiative about spiritual help*. In the majority of the cases, the clergy have not sought the sick or offered help in any way. They have waited to be asked ; and those who most need aid are naturally the last to ask for it. Invalids sinking into self-indulgence in drugs or stimulants, yielding to the unbridled temper which makes the lives of those around them a continual misery ; or others, hardened by suffering, and wrapping themselves in the darkness of unbelief, have no wish to see a priest. Yet few would resent a real effort to help them, or be untouched by any little kindness shewn in sympathy with their illness, which might open the door to further intercourse later on.

Many of the clergy evidently think that educated invalids are a good class, who can safely be left to themselves where more urgent work claims a priest's time ; or they believe that there is a special sanctification in suffering which does more

for a soul than their efforts could do. But nearness to the Cross brings its own sharpness of temptation and its own peculiar responsibility; and now, as on Calvary, there are impenitent as well as penitent sufferers, who defy God in their hearts and rebel against the lot from which they cannot escape. Even under the best conditions, illness is a severe test of character from the 'softness' it often engenders, the wearing effects of pain, and the altered balance it produces in life. The atmosphere of a sick-room may be a forcing-house for faults, where a conspiracy of kindness surrounds a patient, and everything follows the line of least resistance, till all energy is sapped, self-consideration reigns supreme, and a petty tyranny of impatience or exaction becomes established, involving much sacrifice and trouble from others, which the invalid takes as a matter of course. Such cases are known to all; and they may drift on into self-deception and danger until 'the kingly touch of Death is the first thing that makes them real.'

Some of the clergy say, 'I cannot go unless I am sent for,' though they are generally aware of the chronic cases amongst their flock. Invalids ask if the shepherd waits for the sheep to send to him? Is it not his care to look for the absent, and to devise means to find them out? Perhaps the clergy do not realize how many difficulties beset invalids, even where there is a real desire for help; natural shyness, dislike of giving trouble, tacit opposition in the family, or fear of alarming people, often prevent any request being made. An invalid is tempted to think, 'How can I speak to a stranger? How do I know if he can help my need? Perhaps it does not really matter.' So the thought is put aside, in the hope that some opening may come later; or the desire is checked by family criticism, or obstacles are placed in the way which would disappear if any kindly interest were shewn, and effort made, by a clergyman on behalf of the helpless sick person.

In some churches a notice is put up that the sick should send in their names for visits; but many hesitate to ask an *unknown* priest to come, and, even where names have been sent in, there has been a long delay in the visit, and in a



large number of cases no further call or inquiry for the invalid has been made. This discourages them, and they often will not ask again. Invalids constantly say, 'I cannot trouble so and so ; if I do ask for a visit, he does not come for weeks, and then he has no time for anything.' 'He came once, but he has never come again, though my sister and I have both asked him to come.' 'I ask for Communion as seldom as possible, for no one seems to have time to come.' They know how generously many priests give their time to those who *can* go to church, and an added pang is given to physical disability when it hinders access to such help. Many invalids, in false pride, let their souls starve rather than trouble a priest to bring them succour of any kind. They have to be helped out of their mistakes or prejudices as much as any other class has to be roused from its besetting sins.

May a plea be made that, if the clergy are asked to visit a case, they should respond as quickly as they reasonably can ? It has often cost a sick person much effort or difficulty to get the request made ; and a delay of two or three weeks (such as sometimes occurs) may cause a revulsion of feeling, a reserve, or nervous dread of the visit which seriously affects any future intercourse. Instances are known in which the clergy have gone at once, or in a day or two, when asked, and have persevered in visits even when little response seemed made ; and their reward has been great. Sometimes a clergyman comes with a genuine desire to help, but in evident perplexity as to the requirements of the case, or what an invalid can possibly want ; and invalids lack the pluck to say, 'I want what the Church has to give and to say to those in illness ; to meet my temptations, to "strengthen my decays," to shew me what it all means, in my life or for my soul.'

Silence or shyness may veil such thoughts and dim longings for light and help. Some hardly understand what they are missing, or what they might be if only the means of grace were opened to them more fully ; and others have deeper causes of distress—evil habits indulged, sins of the past cherished, sorrows of many kinds, which nothing but

wise and patient care can reach. Many have to be startled into thoughtfulness or awakened to spiritual desire by the earnestness of a priest trying to help them; and even if some refuse to respond, they will not forget any kindness shewn, and at least will not be able to plead before the bar of God that 'no man hath cared for my soul.'

If we could lift a corner of the veil which shrouds the hidden places of such lives, the clergy would see what they have done—or failed to do—for souls in a crisis or in some prolonged suffering that affected the whole life.

It is satisfactory to find that in Mr. Savage's book on Pastoral Visitation so ample a place is given to this duty and to the means of carrying it out. He has done for the clergy what Dr. Schofield did for the members of the medical profession in *The Force of Mind or the Mental Factor in Medicine*. As Dr. Schofield has attempted to define the sphere of the physician of the body, and to open his eyes to the power which he can use if he will, so Mr. Savage has sought to define the sphere of the physician of the soul, and to help him to realize his opportunities.

In one respect, however, the books differ. Dr. Schofield's book is full of examples drawn in great part from his own experience, while Mr. Savage gives us little that can be quoted as directly illustrating his point of view. It would be difficult for a parish priest to publish examples known to him; yet examples from real life, when they can be given without the possibility of identification, are a valuable aid to the exposition of the subject.

The examples quoted in this article are personally known to the writer, who has had a wide experience of the difficulties and temptations of an invalid life, with its inevitably artificial conditions of isolation, helplessness, and self-centredness.

One instance may be given in the invalid's own words :

'When I was four-and-twenty, the strain of long anxiety and the death of the person I loved best in the world ended in a severe illness, when I was thought to be dying. A clergyman was sent for, and I tried to say something of the grief, the hopelessness, the fear of the unknown, which overwhelmed me; but he only told me not to trouble about such thoughts, and after saying the General

Thanksgiving he left. He seemed to me "as one that mocked"; if he had said the General Confession it would have comforted me, but I was left in deeper distress than before, to battle alone for weeks in the darkness of the valley where life or death seem equally hard to face. Four months afterwards, when slowly recovering, a friend sent a priest from another parish to visit me, who at once discovered my need, and brought a higher spiritual power to meet it. He saw that all interest in life had gone, and that I was just in a condition to sink into needless invalidism and add superfluous ailments to my real illness; but each visit was connected with some effort or duty to be done, till I was drawn half-unconsciously to a more normal kind of life. Finding that the Psalms helped me most, an outline of study was planned, and volumes of Neale and Littledale and Spurgeon were lent for research, and a definite amount of work was expected each week, till the brain recovered more power, and other interests were gradually added. Invaluable lessons were taught me with the utmost patience (though some seemed bitter at the time), and the continual exercise of will, self-control, steady mental work, and daily effort restored the balance, and enabled me to resume ordinary life in a year's time. I have always felt that it was owing to this help, under God, that I was saved from becoming a hardened or hopeless invalid.'

Another said sadly :

'For the first ten years of my illness I was a waif and stray in various health resorts, and if a visit was occasionally asked for, it was merely an ordinary call, with no word of help or prayer, and nothing more ever came of it. I began to think my soul didn't matter, till a non-parochial priest was introduced to me on whom I had no claim, who at once took the spiritual line and lifted my dull, petrified life into a new atmosphere. Since then the regular visits, even if he has only ten minutes to spare, are full of teaching and strength. I feel in communion with the fellowship of the Church, taken into the full current of its larger life, and am learning possibilities of hope and progress, mentally and spiritually, through this quickening influence, which were undreamt of before. It makes "all things new," and gives me new thoughts of God, new hopes of Heaven.'

The marked effect of this increased union with the Divine life in the Church is shewn again and again in invalids whose thoughtfulness for others, calmness in danger, and courage under suffering win the admiration of doctors

and nurses. It gives a restfulness that increases strength and adds to their recuperative power, because there is no waste of force in fretful impatience, nor hindrance to progress through self-will and foolish disobedience. They possess, through the means of grace, an inner vitality of which illness cannot rob them, a peace that is untouched by pain, a trust that fears no evil; and they can 'endure, as seeing Him who is invisible,' whose presence is the sunshine of their lives. But these cases are still in the minority; and this plea is made on behalf of the greater majority—restless, dissatisfied, self-absorbed invalids, intensely conscious of every ache or pain, brooding over every trial as a fresh hardship, gloomy and nervous, or wasting life and substance in a 'will o' the wisp' pursuit of health as the one object of existence; who are still unreached and uncared-for, not always by their own fault.

'The isolation of some invalids is little realized. Two men died, with only such help as could be given by letters from a priest at a distance, as their own vicar would not go near them. A lady who had lived in London all her life, an invalid for sixteen years, said truly, "No clergyman ever came to see me, though our vicar knew I was ill and unable to go to church for months together." Now, under the treatment of Christian Science, she is really a new creature, in self-control, patience, and the full exercise of all the powers which had hitherto been neglected. Another, who was hopelessly crippled, was unvisited for twenty years: the parish priest looked in occasionally in a friendly way, but always changed the subject, or left, if she tried to speak of religious subjects. Others who have mustered enough courage to ask for a visit have been thrown back by the obvious indifference of the clergy or their inability to help. An invalid of five-and-thirty, who had been told by London surgeons that she had nothing to look forward to but increased and incurable suffering, possibly lasting for twenty or thirty years, felt the darkness and perplexity, the clouding of faith and loss of courage which were not unnatural under such a verdict. When she spoke of the temptations that assailed her to the priest who visited her occasionally, no attempt was made to meet the distress, and she was only told that "it was best not to think about difficulties." Would any master say that to a boy puzzled over a hard lesson he had to learn? However baffling may be the mystery of God's dealings, surely His messengers have some light of faith

or key of love with which to help those who are in darkness or discouragement over their lessons. A girl of twenty-one, in a serious illness which put an end to all that makes life delightful at that age, after much suffering, asked her mother to send for a clergyman. A kindly, middle-aged rector came, but he carefully avoided all allusion to illness or need, and talked only of a bicycle tour he had lately enjoyed, going away without a word of reading or prayer, and never calling again. It was a bitter disappointment to the patient, who was feeling after something deeper and stronger than her own faith as an anchor in stormy seas; but she only said to her mother, "My brothers can tell me all I want to know about bicycling," and turned her face to the wall for a harder battle than before with rebellion and pain of body and soul. An artist, stricken with blindness, in much suffering, sent messages in vain to her vicar, though she was an old parishioner and had peculiar claims on his care. At last she went herself to ask him to come and help her; he promised, but never came. Now it is too late; the door is shut, in hardness and loss of faith. The widow of a clergyman, with heart disease, said patiently, "I often read over the Visitation office to myself when I am ill, as I have not been visited for five years."

Yet in this case, as in that of the artist, the parish priest is an excellent man, only 'he never visits.' Might he not ask someone else to do so, if he has no time or feels no vocation for such work? Other cases known to the writer have been unvisited for three, seven, ten, and fifteen years. Those who refuse to undertake such visitation (except on the ground of overwork) may be misled by a false idea of the sufferer's spirituality, and may be unaware of the condition of many invalids who may be lapsed communicants, or leading lives of habitual self-indulgence which call for serious effort to rouse them to truth and righteousness. Others have sunk into a slack, low state of self-satisfaction or discouragement, without any thought of spiritual advance. They have no stimulus to progress, no opportunities of religious teaching (for some have little power of reading, and small access to books), no counsel in difficulties or temptations, no help in Bible study, intercession, or prayer, which often becomes lifeless and poor through monotony and solitariness. If such cases seem dull and irresponsible, is it not partly because they have not been shewn a more excellent way?

No one has tried to uplift and enrich these lives, and shew them higher possibilities of sanctification and service. Physical pain, bad nights, enforced stillness and seclusion tell on the whole nature, often injuriously ; all life seems out of joint, and it takes time to get accustomed to altered conditions. Invalids' temptations are as real and their sins are as great as other people's, for they are generally sins against light, and are the worst that they have opportunity for. A comparatively small unfaithfulness may test and betray a soul as fatally as the more open act of a drunkard or criminal ; and the self-will and waste of time and money in health-hunting, the neglect of duty or uncontrolled temper of an invalid, may wreck lives nearly as grievously. The rod and the staff of the pastoral office are surely given for the care of the sick of all classes, as well as for those in health. To check the complaint—inconsiderateness, luxury, or whatever faults are manifest to an outsider—and to give the bracing criticism, the plain rebuke of a sounder judgement or higher standard, is as necessary for those who miss the healthy friction of ordinary life as are the words of comfort or hope to those in suffering of mind or body.

People forget that, physically, invalids miss the invigoration of fresh air and exercise, with their aids in throwing off worry, and the power of gaining new strength from change of scene. Mentally, they miss the quickening, widening influences of social life, the stimulus of fresh ideas from other minds, the refreshment of travel, music, art, lectures, etc. Spiritually, they miss the uplifting power of public worship, family prayers, the help of varied teaching, sermons, hymns, services for the seasons, etc. They can never escape from their surroundings out into the temple of Nature or into the sanctuary of God's house. Forced to spend months or years in one room, fighting against irritability, depression, selfishness, against the gradual decline of energy or effort, and feeling the pressure of monotony, the slow paralysis of spiritual life—as it seems at times—an invalid is peculiarly dependent on the aid which the Church can give ; and those who have known the lack of it, the loneliness of fierce temptation and struggle in the long silent battle, know also what a bracing sense of

fellowship and stronger current of vitality the restoration of visitation brings. They are not always in a state of spiritual crisis needing exceptional help; but they require the steady upbuilding of regular teaching which affects the whole life. Too frequent Confession for invalids is apt to foster undue sensitiveness and scruples, or develop a 'religiousness' which, unbalanced by a proper exercise of the moral sense and mental judgement, tends to unreality and blinding self-deceit. The right training of the whole nature is necessary for true growth; and invalids who miss the ordinary education of life in the world are more dependent on the influence of those who will give them a higher standard, a wider outlook, than can generally be found in a sick-room.

The use or abuse of bodies which are the temples of the Holy Ghost, of minds which are His instruments, is a problem of invalid life to-day. Many become needless invalids through self-indulgence or through lack of training of will and mind 'to control or ignore the turbulences of the nervous system'<sup>1</sup>; others are increasingly practising Christian Science, with its vein of truth<sup>2</sup> amid much false religion and philosophy; while many weaker ones, cut off from wider help, sink into a warped, discontented condition, which is pitiable for themselves and injurious to those around them. Long experience has proved that much may be done by steady religious training and teaching, spiritual influence, and regular communion; but in large parishes where frequent visiting is practically impossible, or in exceptional cases, such ministration can only be given by the aid of outside help from men of experience and devotion.

If the clergy think that invalids do not require such individual attention, or that the help they need lies outside a priest's office, it may be useful to call their attention to some words of Sir James Paget to his students several years ago, which shew clearly his opinion of the requirements of special cases.

<sup>1</sup> Sir James Paget.

<sup>2</sup> See Professor William James's *Talks to Teachers on Psychology*, and Dr. Schofield's books.



'Many nerve disorders take the form of unwitting imitation of organic disease, and are serious, as making life restless and unhappy and not rarely shortening it. They are more frequent in the more cultivated than in the rougher classes; but in the majority of such cases there is something higher or lower than the average, and you are likely to meet with them among the very good, the very wise, and most accomplished women. . . . Doctors cannot help such patients until they help themselves. Habit, distaste, want of energy are against them; but an effort *must* be made. Those who will not eat, but who take stimulants and narcotics, have no chance. Fresh interests, to turn the mind from all thoughts of illness, are a great help. It is erroneous when such patients are charged with inventing their sufferings, which are real; but the fault is that they attend too much to them, and attention makes all pain sharper. . . . Most of all, the will needs training to the endurance of pain; education in the control of movements, the cure of mimicry, and the fixing of attention elsewhere than on disease. The dangers of such illnesses are the temptation to remain weak; to let emotion, sentiment, weaken self-control, and so perhaps lower true womanly reserve, dignity, and self-respect; to let untruthfulness colour statements or foster unreality; to be proud of sensitiveness and the interesting condition of an invalid. Such things, yielded to, are *moral suicide*.'

Can priests ignore such needs, or say that the Church has no mission to those who suffer and are tempted in such ways? There are cases known to the writer in which lives have been lost through operations insisted upon or made necessary through impatience and want of control, when the surgeons have found nothing wrong. We may cite other instances with which we are acquainted:

'One lady died of wilful starvation—the doctors could give no other verdict at the inquest, as no cause of death could be assigned; and the terrors of the poor patient's death-bed for days, when she realized too late what she had done, haunted her nurses for long afterwards. It is sometimes in the power of the clergy to give the very incentive to effort, or strong influence to shake off bad habits, which may rouse and save patients at a crisis in their lives; and they may by wise suggestion or steady employment, direct and increase the mental powers which are needed to combat disease successfully. A girl of fourteen was seriously ill and in great suffering, besides being perplexed in a childish way by the mystery of pain, and the sceptical ideas picked up from her brothers. A

kindly old priest—the hero of his fisher-folk—came to visit her, and took as much trouble to unravel her puzzles as if she had been a man, directing his reading and prayer to all the special points spoken of. But he did not think his office ended there; he tried to see what distractions or interests were possible, and how far “the expulsive power of a new affection” might refresh the tired little mind. Finding out her love of painting, he brought sheets of card to be illuminated with verses and passages on special subjects which she had first to find out; and the pleasure of doing this was a great incentive to sitting up when well enough to paint. He also sent another girl, little older than the patient, to teach her lace-making; and the fascination of her Honiton pillow, with its endless bobbins requiring minute attention, beguiled many weary hours. When the doctor, in mistaken kindness, began morphia injections, and the child lost her nerve, the sense of what this friend expected of her made her ashamed of the fits of crying, and helped to strengthen self-control and endurance when the morphia was discontinued. It was only a three months’ kindness on his part, in weekly visits; but it left a mark for a lifetime on her character, and though no other visitation came in ten years of subsequent illness, she never forgot the lessons of his ministry.

‘In another case where a young invalid was ordered to lie still for two years, as the one chance of recovery, the priest who visited her lent books of natural history as a link with outdoor life, and this led on to some natural science, which proved a useful key to future interests with her brothers and schoolboys. Again, a course of European history was planned, and outline notes reviewed from time to time, which gave the necessary guidance and stimulus for steady reading, and kept alive healthy energy, capable of use afterwards in teaching others.’

Such help need not take much time; but it makes all the difference if a clergyman thus takes in the whole nature and all the possibilities of the person visited, and gives more hope of restoration to efficient work in after-life.

To train the sick in self-help, to try to use the various faculties and mental processes which are now more fully understood, and which are invaluable aids in recovery, to build up moral strength and check deterioration and waste of powers, these surely are duties that lie within the teaching office of the Church. The influence of mind over body, the principles of psychology, which are now taught to all pupil-

teachers in National schools for the education of young lives, and which are recognized by doctors on all sides, should be applied for spiritual healing and growth—'to make the body the servant of the mind, and both the servants of Jesus Christ.'

It would surely be a gain if a course of instruction on these subjects could be given to those preparing for ordination, for many do not possess the special gift of dealing with the sick in a helpful and common-sense way.

Amongst the many encouraging signs of the time we rejoice to find unity of thought between some of those who claim to deal with these questions from the medical and spiritual point of view. It is the theologian who recognizes that invalids must be roused to self-help, must be trained in habits of unselfishness, and taught to take an interest in the lives of others.<sup>1</sup> It is the doctor who reminds us of Plato's words, 'The good soul improves the body,' and says 'Sympathy, religion, common-sense . . . are all at times good mental medicines.'<sup>2</sup>

We are in agreement with Dr. Schofield when he points out that 'Philosophy, theology, and medicine touch each other to-day as they have ever done at certain points, and there is a transition-ground which is common to all,' and are thankful that he can testify that 'The Church no longer treats the soul and ignores the man, but the case of the human being as a whole—spirit, soul, and body—is increasingly coming to the front.' 'In the same way,' he continues, 'the wise physician must grasp the underlying unity of the spiritual and material, and recognise that if the body may and does influence diseases of the soul, so does the mind influence states and diseases of the body.'

Mr. Savage's book is a witness to the fact that the Church is beginning to realize the greatness of her opportunity in this direction. It is full of the sense of the value of individual souls, and is penetrated by the spirit of a true shepherd who 'callesth his sheep by name.' The importance of regular visiting and systematic teaching is admirably enforced,

<sup>1</sup> *Pastoral Visitation*, pp. 85, 86.

<sup>2</sup> *The Force of Mind*, pp. 19, 20, 21, and 209.

together with the care, the thought, the truth and faithfulness required in such ministry.

In the matter of visitation, invalids meet with two difficulties. There is the preoccupation of some clergy, who frankly declare that they cannot visit chronic cases, and will only go to them with the Sacraments ; and there is the rigid parochialism of those priests who set their faces against all outside help, and resent any visits from other clergy within their borders, and on the same principle refuse to go to a sick person in another parish who asks their aid in a special emergency.

When the principle of parochialism is no longer insisted upon in towns for those in health, why should it be made obligatory for the sick ? And in country parishes, where peculiar circumstances create difficulties at times, why should an invalid be forbidden to obtain help from elsewhere ? Or in large parishes, where clergy are sorely overworked, why should not invalid, retired, or non-parochial clergy be permitted to undertake certain cases which need regular visits ? Their co-operation, if wisely allowed, might be a relief to those in charge, and an untold benefit to the sick. Of course, due loyalty to the parish priest and due consideration of clerical etiquette must be shewn, and no mere caprice indulged ; but fair treatment on both sides should be our aim. When the Prayer Book bids the clergy invite any troubled soul to 'come to me, or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God's Word,' who can forbid an invalid access to another clergyman, supposing, let us say, an Evangelical needed comfort from one of similar views, or another had a 'grief' which possibly for local or family reasons could not be opened to the vicar, or some burdened conscience required 'counsel and benefit' which the latter might not be able or willing to give in authoritative form ? Yet many outside priests, when asked to help, refuse to visit at all (some will not even correspond) 'without the knowledge and consent of the vicar.' No such conditions are imposed on other people ; why should the sick, amid other deprivations, be robbed of a liberty and privacy in spiritual matters which the others enjoy as an unquestioned right ? In places known to us four

different clergy, when asked, either refused to allow or to undertake outside visitation in their own or other parishes when special cases were brought before them ; and another said he would only go to a sick person in extreme need, on conditions which made such help impossible. Overworked clergy may have to make rules in self-defence, but none of these men had large parishes or many claims on their time. They did not understand how naturally an invalid, accustomed to sacramental teaching, would shrink from asking counsel of a rector who had Evening Communion and would refuse (as has happened in some cases) to meet a desire for Confession in serious illness as an act of preparation for death. And, on the other hand, sympathy must be felt with those who have grown old in different habits of thought, and who fear to ask for spiritual aid from parish priests, who would urge Confession and fasting Communion upon them. One invalid said, 'Our vicar looks in occasionally, but he never reads or prays unless I ask for it ; and, after seven years, I don't seem to know him better or get any help.' Would not outside ministry be valuable in such a case ? A person in health could easily turn elsewhere for aid ; but a sick person has to go on thus indefinitely unless some succour is sent. After experience of many difficulties of this kind, the opinion of the Bishop of St. Andrews was asked. He replied that he considered that any invalid had a right to ask for another clergyman to come thus, if necessary, and that only for celebrations was the consent of the vicar needful ; but he felt that in such cases the invalid, or the clergyman visiting the sick person, should mention the fact to the parish priest, to make everything more straightforward. He advised recourse to the Bishop of the diocese, where objection was raised ; but few invalids would make complaints, or risk the further troubles such action might involve.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The whole question of outside help or non-parochial visitation, and the frequent pressing of fasting Communion on the sick, was brought before some other priests of wide experience in spiritual ministrations. They agreed with the Bishop of St. Andrews as to an invalid's right to seek outside help if required, and considered that, although it was

To bring the matter, then, to a practical issue : have we not a right to ask that the Church, which is 'the Mother of us all,' should extend her ministry to those unable to attend her services on the same terms and with the same liberty that she allows to those in health? A plea may be entered for equality of treatment for the sick and the whole. It is not too much to ask for :—

I. *Regular Visitation* for reading and prayer (or at least occasional help) of a kind suited to the individual's needs and views, given on the same principle of liberty which allows those in health to attend what church they like, to go to special services or retreats, and to seek assistance from whom they will, no man forbidding them. Why should the sick be denied a similar freedom in the use of 'means of grace,' which they sorely need, but for which they are dependent on the kindness of others?

II. *Regular Communion when possible*, and unfettered by restrictions of fasting in cases where it is injurious to health, and where this is not recognized by the individual as 'of obligation' in time of real illness.

With regard to Communion for the sick, difficulties are made chiefly by those clergy who, by insisting upon fasting, sometimes deprive invalids for months of their Communions, thus adding to the strain of illness, and creating a conflict

courteous and ecclesiastically correct for the outsider to inform the parish priest of such visits, this need only be done in a general way, by just mentioning that a call had been made on so-and-so; that it need not be specified if any Confession were made, as that is covered by the term to 'visit the sick'; and that the Bishop should be consulted if any opposition were raised. About fasting Communion, they strongly advised invalids not to raise the question, but to act on their own consciences; if a priest raised it, let the invalid say that it was his own concern, and that he would take the responsibility. If refusal of Communion followed, the Bishop ought certainly to be appealed to. The obligation to communicate was of Divine command; the fast was one of ecclesiastical law, which the Divine order might overrule in such cases. Also they held that a large body of theological writers agreed that serious illness '*ipso facto*' dispensed sick persons from the fast. This independent opinion and advice is a great gain, as upholding liberty of conscience for individuals in their Communions when ill, and guarding the sacredness of Confession where it is required.



between authorities, husbands or parents, and clergy. Such priests unhesitatingly teach that to break the fast in the smallest degree is not only a dishonour to our Lord in the Sacrament, but also a sin against the Holy Ghost in His Temple. It is impossible not to shrink from the materialism of some of the arguments used, and from the inconsistency of some of the practices inculcated ; but weak consciences are frightened and burdens are added, which in their enfeebled state they find too heavy to be borne.

Invalids are told that it is part of the discipline of illness to be deprived of Communion, that they must think more of the honour of our Lord in His Sacrament than of their own needs ; and so numbers drift on for weeks or months, feeling keenly what they miss in their weakness or pain, or, what is worse, growing slack for want of the check which preparation involves, and sometimes acknowledging, 'I am almost glad that I may not communicate at present, my life seems so unworthy, my religion so feeble and fitful.' Others are sometimes content with one Communion in the six winter months, thus sinking far below the ordinary level of what a communicant should aim at.

Instances are known to the writer where parents and husbands have protested in vain about the risk to delicate people of going fasting to early Celebrations in winter.

'A young wife died as the result of this practice ; another, through repeated chills caught thus, is now a helpless invalid for life, while others go on in a chronic state of illness for themselves and irritation for their families every winter. One invalid was deprived of Communion for three months, as she might not go out early in winter without food ; she made a great effort to be allowed to communicate on Easter Day at a late service, but was told it was far better to go without Communion than to communicate unworthily. In consequence she went to the early service fasting, and this caused a long illness for months after. A girl who was very ill with congestion of the lungs, and in circumstances of peculiar trial, begged for her Easter Communion, but was told, "It is out of the question ; you cannot fast at present, and only if you were actually dying would I communicate you non-fasting." She had to wait till after Ascensiontide before the priest would celebrate for her. A lady recovering from bronchitis, and being



told that it was wilful sin to break her fast before Communion, refused the usual hot milk or tea in the early morning before her private celebration at 8.30 ; but an extra-cold night had increased the cough, and she was quite exhausted when the service was over. A relapse and pneumonia followed, with serious illness for months. Sometimes after operations, when patients are in acute suffering, and have to battle with all the miseries of nerve disturbance, sleeplessness, leaving off narcotics, and the difficulties of trying to resume ordinary life, they are kept for eight or nine weeks without Communion because of the fast.'

The pressure of fasting Communion is a special hardship for the sick, as the priest makes his own conditions for them ; whereas in health the majority of people can, if they choose, approach the Altar on the responsibility of their own conscience without restraint or interference. A similar exercise of individual judgement and responsibility ought surely to be allowed to the sick, who are in need of spiritual strength and more abundant life. When a soul is slowly passing down the valley, through months of increasing weakness or the prolonged struggle of serious illness, shall not God's messenger bring the Bread of Life, saying, 'Arise and eat ; because the journey is too great for thee' ; and so refresh the weary spirit on its way to the Mount of God ? Invalids are continually asking for the prayers of others in the trial of deprivation of Communion. Is there not something artificial in this making of an ecclesiastical law greater than a Divine command ? May we not believe our Lord's own word, that 'not that which goeth into the mouth defileth,' and feel that if we prepare in true penitence and desire for the Bread of Life, He will not forbid the suffering—often so weary and heavy laden—to 'draw near with faith, and take this Holy Sacrament to their comfort.'

The question of parochial etiquette is also allowed at times to give needless pain, as it seems, to invalids ; for it is not easy to obtain permission for outside administration of the Holy Communion where it is sought under special circumstances. Three cases, in different towns, in which consent was refused, illustrate the want of thought, or sympathetic consideration, which makes difficulties.

'A dying man asked an old personal friend, a priest, to celebrate for him, but the rector forbade it, saying it was his own office to do this. A clergyman spending a few days at the sea went to see a former servant in a home, who greatly desired to receive the Holy Communion from her master once more ; but on his asking leave he was told that the vicar would arrange for her Communion himself. Again, an invalid had received much spiritual help from her vicar ; but when circumstances necessitated a move into an adjoining parish, the parish priest there refused to let her former vicar celebrate for her when she was dying.'

Of course, in itself it did not really matter which administered the Blessed Sacrament ; but, in thus insisting upon their rights, did not these priests lose an opportunity of giving much happiness to the sick and dying ? The means of grace, the personal influence of the ministry, should be a fountain of spiritual life and hope to those who now seem stranded in a barren and dry land, who grow warped and irritable, callous or self-indulgent, for lack of the Bread of Life, the shepherd's watchfulness, and the training to which they have a rightful claim.

Passing from these points of detail, it is important to realize that if the Church gradually relinquishes this part of her ministry, the work and its reward will pass to others, who are already gathering in souls, and leading them to a happier and better condition, through the exercise of prayer, faith, self-control, and the effort of all mental and spiritual powers. The hearts of those who are most loyal members of the Church burn within them when difficulties and rebuffs check the endeavours of sufferers to obtain help, and when liberty of action and conscience are stifled by the rigid practice and teaching of some clergy. They know the incalculable blessing that flows from communion with the full life of the Church, and they see the despondency and general ineffectiveness of invalid lives which miss this higher force to control and develop them, and to keep them from trying dangerous experiments which often end in schism and sin.

---

## ART. III.—HYMNS AND HYMN-BOOKS.

1. *Hymns Ancient and Modern*. New Edition. (London : Clowes and Sons, 1904.)
2. *Church Hymns*. New Edition. (London : S.P.C.K., 1903.)
3. *The Methodist Hymn-Book*. New Edition. (London : Wesleyan Conference Office, 1904.)
4. *Additional Hymns*. (London : Novello and Co., 1903.)
5. *Public School Hymn-Book*. Edited by a Committee of the Headmasters' Conference. (London : Novello, 1903.)
6. *Hampshire Hymn-Book*, for use in Council Schools. (Portsmouth : Holbrook and Son, 1904.)

WHAT is a hymn and what is its relation to poetry ? This is a difficult question, yet one which it would seem necessary to decide before compiling a hymn-book.

On a superficial view we might be inclined to say simply that hymns are one subsection of poetry, and to expect that just as our finest churches are built by our greatest architects, and our most moving anthems composed by our greatest musicians, so our hymns should be written by our poets. But an examination of the collections before us brings us face to face with the surprising fact that we have few hymns by great poets, and those are not great hymns. Milton's own version of 'Let us with a gladsome mind' is found only in *Church Hymns* ; it is a delicate, fanciful poem, but too far removed from the popular consciousness to be a perfect hymn. William Wordsworth's 'Up to the throne of God' shews some of the ultra-prosaic lines in which his soul rejoiced :

'He [the Sun] cannot halt, or go astray,  
But our immortal spirits may.'<sup>1</sup>

We should allow that Edmund Spenser's 'Most glorious Lord of Life' (included in none of these collections) is a good hymn, but yet not so good a hymn as many a man has written who is not a poet at all. Dryden's translation,

<sup>1</sup> *A. & M.* 12.

'Creator Spirit'<sup>1</sup> is somewhat too academic for popular singing; George Herbert's holy and delicate 'Let all the world in every corner sing'<sup>2</sup> lacks some of the vigorous hold upon the soul that a really great hymn implies. 'Crossing the Bar,'<sup>3</sup> with its dim, sweet hope, we cannot call a hymn at all. Indeed, those who were at the funerals of our two great poets will have been struck by the fact that of all the writings of Tennyson, of Robert Browning and his wife, it was possible to find for singing no lines expressive of nearer relation between the surrendered soul and its God than those three poems, tender, sweet, resigned and vaguely touched with hope, 'Silent Voices,' 'Crossing the Bar,' and 'He giveth His beloved sleep.'

On the other hand, the great hymn-writers are mostly either not known as poets at all, like the Wesleys, John Newton, and Isaac Williams; or else as inferior poets, like Isaac Watts. Keble perhaps, in 'Sun of my soul,' may rise to the first rank of hymn-writers, but no one would put him in the first rank of poets; though his hymn 'Now the stars are lit in heaven' (again absent from all the collections under review) is full of mystical poetry.

Cowper is pre-eminently the man who is in an equal degree a poet and a hymn-writer. Yet even with him we are not sure whether sometimes, as in 'Ere God had built the mountains' or 'Sometimes a light surprises,'<sup>4</sup> the poetry does not take away force from the hymn; whether the simple æsthetic delight of such lines as

'He wrought by weight and measure;  
And I was with Him then:  
Myself the Father's pleasure,  
And Mine, the sons of men!'

does not too much lead the mind away from the full, or rather the immediate, consideration of their meaning which the fact of singing demands.

Too subtle a thought, too delicately poetical an expression, does undoubtedly detract from the power of a hymn:

<sup>1</sup> *C. H.* 191, *M. H.* 228.

<sup>2</sup> *A. & M.* 318, *C. H.* 457.

<sup>3</sup> *A. & M.*, *C. H.*, *M. H.*

<sup>4</sup> *M. H.* 60, 479.

it cannot be brooded over, for the act of worship must proceed. The tune, too, has to be repeated; yet, as few hymns are in one mood, the words cannot always have the same relation to the music. Most mission hymns, for instance, are in three moods: the alienated or doubtful mood; the crisis or invitation; the triumph or reconciliation. It may be questioned whether these are not too many variations for a tune, however subordinated and well rendered, to express.

Various collections, and notably the *Methodist Hymn-Book*, have made praiseworthy attempts to press poets into the service of hymnology; and some of these attempts are certainly successful. Whittier is not always too subtle, and it has been a good thought to include 'Immortal Love' and 'Dear Lord and Father of mankind' in the *Public School Hymn-Book*.<sup>1</sup> There is a power of simple reality in some verses, that quality which appeals, perhaps, with the most force to a boy's mind. It is strange that, among such abundance of religious lyrics as Christina Rossetti has given us, only three have been included in any hymn-book, and those not very suitable for the purpose.<sup>2</sup> Here again we are thrown back on the supposition that too much poetry may have made these exquisite mystical verses an unprofitable quarry for hymns. Compare Christina Rossetti with Miss Procter, till better with Charlotte Elliott, or Miss Havergal. As the quality of poetry declines, as the more simple mind asserts itself, in proportion as straightforward sentiment takes the place of delicate mystical feeling, the verses become more suitable for hymns, and what we may call an equal religious fervour is really more able to make itself felt.

Perhaps we might venture to enunciate the general principle that the preoccupation of the poet is primarily with Nature; of the hymn-writer primarily with God. Nature in the hymn must be a little conventionalized, or rather a little *generalized*, like details and colouring in statuary or architecture: 'Greenland's icy mountains and India's coral strand' are a proportionate landscape for a hymn. Whether it is man's nature or the world's nature, it

<sup>1</sup> *P. S. H.* 263, 234; *M. H.* 118, 119, 410.

<sup>2</sup> *M. H.* 520, *C. H.* 123, 479, 583.

must be a little subdued, a little limited, on the side that is not Godward. The man whom we call primarily a poet finds it difficult to do this ; we shall find poetry and hymn-writing more evenly balanced in the case of the minor poets and the greater hymn-writers. Such men as Cowper, Whittier, Palgrave, Montgomery, Keble, touch hands with Newton and the Wesleys, Watts, and Heber. It would be an interesting and not unprofitable study to compare such an ode as Shelley's 'Life of Life' with such a hymn as John Wesley's translation 'O God, of good the unfathomed sea.'<sup>1</sup> The metre of the six-lined verses is the same, though the free rhyme and rhythm of the first is disciplined into the strong march of the second ; the very conception of beauty enveloped in the blinding light of love, in which self is lost, is the same ; yet infinity lies between the etherealized sensuousness of Shelley and the spiritual perception of Scheffler's hymn.<sup>2</sup>

Again, the poet may appeal to a limited circle and be none

<sup>1</sup> *M. H.* 36, *A.* & *M.* 494 (fragmentary).

<sup>2</sup> Compare the conceptions of such lines as

'Life of Life ! thy lips enkindle  
With their love the breath between them ;  
And thy smiles before they dwindle  
Make the cold air fire. . . .

Child of light ! thy limbs are burning  
Through the veil which seems to hide them ;

And this atmosphere divinest  
Shrouds thee wheresoe'er thou shinest.

with

Thou shin'st with everlasting rays ;  
Before the insufferable blaze  
Angels with both wings veil their eyes.

or

Fair are others ; none beholds thee,  
But thy voice sounds low and tender  
Like the fairest, for it folds thee  
From the sight, that liquid splendour.

with

Primeval Beauty ! in Thy sight  
The firstborn, fairest sons of light  
See all their brightest glories fade.'

the worse poet ; while the hymn-writer must find the point which touches the essential human consciousness. Yet in spite of these differences, in spite too of many of the productions before us, hymns *have* something to do with poetry.

We may divide hymns into three chief classes : spontaneous or poignant hymns, written under the pressure of some great idea ; hymns written with the intention of expressing some truth or some special situation ; and emotional hymns written under the influence of some feeling. These latter are sometimes little distinguished from hymns of the first class, except that they express a feeling rather than an idea ; and sometimes little distinguished from the second class, except that they are less deliberately undertaken. Mission hymns would be here included. Paraphrases and translations can be best classed with intentional hymns. The mind deliberately turns to its task ; yet becomes sometimes so inspired by its subject that it seems to appropriate the idea and reproduce it freely and spontaneously. Thus 'O God, our help in ages past,' does not appear to us to be a paraphrase, nor 'Jesus lives' a translation.

To each of the classes enumerated corresponds a kind of parody, hardly less frequently included in hymn-books than the original type. To the emotional hymn corresponds the meretricious hymn where the feeling does not ring true, but attaches itself, perhaps, to some telling phrase. To the spontaneous hymn corresponds the sentimental hymn, written with great swing and flow, but under the impulse of no idea at all, or a weak idea. Such hymns revel in double rhymes and indulge in that dangerous adjective, 'supernal,' which suggests two such easy and forcible rhymes. Such a line as 'Imperfect rehearsal of anthems supernal' has, perhaps, the maximum of polysyllables to the minimum of meaning.

To the intentional hymn corresponds the dull hymn, written by an effort praiseworthy in its conscientiousness, if only that sense had been otherwise directed. Church hymn-books must be peculiarly liable to hymns of this kind from their endeavour to find hymns for every occasion, and (with the tendencies of the present generation) for every kind of well-directed religious energy. We remember the bishop



who was asked to authorize a service for the dedication of a stove ; and so many are the special objects for which hymns are assigned in some of the books before us, that we are inclined to wonder why the catalogue has not been made quite complete and to ask why there is not a hymn, *e.g.*, about the housing of the poor. The new National Anthem is of this type :

‘ Lord, make the nations see  
That men should brothers be  
And form one family,  
The wide world o’er.’<sup>1</sup>

There is a hymn, too, about the dangers of the higher criticism and the advantage of well-directed theological study.

‘ Woe if thou spurn a line  
By wilfulness enticed.

Once to the saints was given  
All blessed gospel lore ;  
There, written down in words from heaven,  
Thou hast it evermore.

Toil at thy sacred text . . .<sup>2</sup>

Good hymn-writers, like the author of the above, are very apt to fall into this snare. The fact that they can write good hymns blinds them to the fact that they can also write bad ones, or rather that they cannot always write good ones because they wish to do so. Even Charles Wesley can over-write himself and say :

‘ Come, let us anew  
Our journey pursue,  
With vigour arise,  
And press to our permanent place in the skies ;’<sup>3</sup>

or urge retreat from the world and ‘ all its frantic ways ’ :

‘ One only thing resolved to know,  
And square our useful lives below  
By reason and by grace.’<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Add. H.* 945.

<sup>2</sup> *M. H.* 614.

<sup>3</sup> *A. & M.* 396.

<sup>4</sup> *M. H.* 599.

A hymn is rendered dull by too eager a desire to impart information :

'St. George, "The Martyr Great,"  
The Church to-day recalls,  
Who "good confession witnessed"  
'Neath Nicomedia's walls.'<sup>1</sup>

Information is out of place in a hymn, for it must either be addressed by the congregation to themselves, or to a quarter where it is still more superfluous. It is not necessary, for instance, to specify (particularly in a general Saint's-day hymn) :

'The Saint of whom we sing to-day  
Was faithful to Thy loving call.'<sup>2</sup>

The realization of great doctrines has been the cause of the finest outbursts of hymns, but the deliberate versification of doctrine is another matter. What could be more irrational than to translate the beautiful and moving prose of the Catechism into such lines as :

'When brought by sponsors to the Font  
My Christian name was given. . . .  
Three things my sponsors, standing by,  
Did promise then for me.'<sup>3</sup>

We question whether this is a hymn or a *memoria technica*, and are reminded that :

'King John his young nephew, in one two nought two,  
In a castle of Rouen most cruelly slew.'

It is not so good as the versification of the Bible by children in an American story :

'Elijah by the brook ;  
He, by ravens fed,  
Took from their horny beaks  
Pieces of meat and bread.'

An argument too solidly clenched is out of place in a hymn, like the details suggestive of Capital and Interest which occupied two full verses in the much-loved Alms-

<sup>1</sup> *Add. H.* 953.

<sup>2</sup> *A. & M.* 211.

<sup>3</sup> *Add. H.* 962.

giving hymn—one of which is now rightly omitted from the new edition of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*.<sup>1</sup> The old hymn :

‘Go, blow the trump on India’s shore,  
And bid the Hindoo weep no more,’

in one early form hastened to obey the injunction as far as was possible by adding a chorus which contained the direct appeal, *Hindoo, weep no more!* But such conscientiousness, again, is out of place in a hymn. Hymns, in fact, must presuppose their moral motive and their information. If the worshipper does not know who St. Matthew is and has not been able to find out from the Lessons or the Gospel it really will not do him much good to sing :

‘He sat to watch o’er customs paid,  
A man of scorn’d and hardening trade.’<sup>2</sup>

Hymns, in fact, should be on quite a different level from that implied by the versification just quoted.

What, then, is the essential quality which at the same time connects hymns with poetry and differentiates them from other poetry ?

Stress has sometimes been laid on the form of the invocation ; and in trying to account for the reasons why certain hymns have been excluded from the books before us, it is difficult not to think that this has been occasionally the determining factor. Why should the most beautiful Epiphany hymn, Heber’s ‘Brightest and best of the sons of the morning’ not be found in the *Ancient and Modern* collection, except for the reason that it appears to be addressed to the Star of Bethlehem ? But if this be a sufficient reason, why are not hymns apostrophizing the Festal Day or the heavenly Jerusalem also excluded ? Surely the poetical petition to the star is not seriously thought of as a prayer. If ‘Awake, thou that sleepest,’ is really the beginning of the earliest Christian hymn, exhortations are admissible ; but Heber’s ‘Brightest and best,’ though addressed to a star, is really an exhortation. It is obvious that the apparent address of a hymn may

<sup>1</sup> *A. & M.* 547.

<sup>2</sup> *A. & M.* 238.

be a very unessential matter, for it may not express the real purport at all.

The essential qualities of a hymn will be found not by the discussion of any such details but through the fundamental consideration of its object, its purport, and its form. It is impossible to sum up the purport of hymns under one head. Expressions of praise, of wonder, of prayer; exhortations, declarations of mysteries, narrations, might be illustrated by typical examples which no one could dispute. 'Praise, my soul, the King of heaven' is simply a hymn of praise; 'Shepherd Divine,' from first to last, a prayer. That exquisite hymn of Isaac Williams (omitted in every collection before us), 'The High Priest once a year,' is the declaration of a mystery; 'In token that thou shalt not fear' an exhortation; 'While shepherds watched their flocks by night' simply a narrative hymn. But more usually hymns pass from one to other of these moods. 'Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire,' which appears to be simply a prayer, culminates in the ascription of praise. 'Where high the heavenly temple stands' leads up to the exhortation 'With boldness therefore, at the Throne, Let us make all our sorrows known.'

Hymns would be made more simple than they are in this respect if their collectors did not seem to think it necessary, in a hurried and conscience-stricken way, to fit on a doxology, however inappropriate or unnecessary. Thus the revisers of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* still retain the doxology at the end of 'When I survey the wondrous Cross,' although this direct ascription of praise falsifies the whole feeling of the hymn, whose every line is the expression of a wonder which renders all offerings and all words inadequate.<sup>1</sup>

If the purport of hymns includes some such range of elements as we have indicated, the special object is so to present them as by a soft impulsion of the soul to lift the aspiration of man towards a closer relation to God. Much, therefore, in a hymn may be a prelude to the expression of this aspiration. Even if the hymn itself seems almost entirely

<sup>1</sup> A. & M. 120. C. H., P. S. H., and M. H. all rightly omit the doxology.

prelude, it may have its proper relation towards the service of which it is a part. Thus some hymns which seem to contain no new idea may yet in their effect gently widen the horizon of the soul. Such a hymn as 'Hark, hark, my soul,' is thus justified. It does not indeed suggest any very clear thought, but the image of the twilight world, with land and sea stretching away, the soft sound of bells, and the voice of the Lord calling, seems to banish the grosser elements of thought, to calm the soul and predispose it to spiritual converse.

But other hymns, far less to be defended from a literary point of view, vulgar in their art, even obtuse in their ideas, have also, we are told, 'a great effect.' 'Yes, tell my darling mother I'll be there,'<sup>1</sup> we lately heard, is known to 'have an effect' where nothing else does. Are we to include all these? Surely we must ask what the effect is. Has it really a spiritualizing effect to sing 'It was good for our mothers, and it's good enough for me,'<sup>2</sup> or to chant cheerfully 'A little talk with Jesus makes it right, all right.'<sup>3</sup> How far is familiarity a gain if it tends to diminish reverence? It is a mere commonplace that what is an aid at one time may be a hindrance at another, and hymns which may soften a hard mind or startle a gross one might in permanent or frequent use, enervate or vulgarize.

In all this consideration we must remember that the connexion of words with music has a special and particular psychological effect. The best musician is not necessarily the best authority about hymns, or even about hymn tunes. The hymn tune, like the hymn itself, must be determined partly in relation to the congregation, and with reference to their voices as well as to their minds. It may be that the best hymn tunes are, in the right sense of the word, also the most popular. But to determine *prima facie* that a tune is in itself the right kind of tune is impossible.

Yet, if we are inclined to feel at times that the revisers of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* have attempted to revive plain-song a little absolutely, it will be seen that they have given ample choice in these matters, and have added some beautiful tunes of another kind: for example, the tune of

<sup>1</sup> *Alexander's Revival Hymns*, 13.    <sup>2</sup> *A. R. H.* 7.    <sup>3</sup> *A. R. H.* 108.

'Praise, my soul, the King of heaven.' Some music of this character too, it may be urged, is already well within the reach of an English congregation, and even a little practice will improve it; it would seem impossible to those, for instance, who have known 'The Royal Banners' to the plain-song music to sing it to anything less severe.

One point in which we can well study the special psychological effect of music is in the case of refrains. The ear waits for the rhythm of words, but with much more intensity and keener memory for the cadence of music. Thus the value of refrain is very different when it is sung. And here, from both the artistic and emotional side, we become quickly aware of the necessity for restraint in the use of refrains. Artistically it is ruinous, for instance, to break up a peculiarly poetical hymn like 'There is a fountain filled with blood' by the persistent, obstinate chorus 'I do believe, I will believe.' Emotionally one has felt in a Salvation Army meeting how quickly a refrain of invitation might rouse the emotions beyond the control of thought or will. On the other hand, such a refrain as 'O Lamb of God, I come,' or the chorus of many a mission hymn, will give the opportunity for slow-moving simple minds really to grasp an idea, and will rouse an emotion which quickens thought and will. The ear waits for it, the mind half consciously begins to expect it, the heart to desire it, until the will accepts it.

In all this, as we see, there is a real value in art; taste is not simple caprice. Canons of taste may change; things thought beautiful be cast out for a while, to be brought back again. The literary beauty of the Proverbs of Solomon may be overlooked at times, but cannot be long hidden, while the *Proverbial Philosophy* of Tupper will never re-appear. In fact, over and above enjoyment, the actual service which good art in hymns renders to religion is that it erects, so to speak, sign-posts of warning about emotional effects, and directions to paths of safety and truth; for in the long run the things most beautiful have the greatest power of suggesting spiritual images, and the least effect in limiting the mind to a narrow circle of ideas. And it is especially noticeable in the case of hymns that the most beautiful commend them-

selves equally to educated and uneducated minds. A man of agnostic views and academic taste like Henry Sidgwick has been heard to say that the lines :

‘See from His head, His hands, His feet,  
Sorrow and love flow mingling down’

could hardly be surpassed in literary perfection. Yet ‘When I survey the wondrous Cross’ is one of the four or five hymns that are most popular in England. We should not hesitate to say that it would almost anywhere be safe to expect a congregation to sing without book either this hymn, ‘Jesu, Lover of my soul,’ ‘O God, our help in ages past,’ or ‘Rock of ages’; yet all these certainly rise to the first rank of English hymns from the literary as well as from the emotional point of view.

The purport of a hymn is too often confused with its object. We need not go into the question of the objective value of worship to defend the position that hymn-singing is the part of the service specially intended to have an effect upon the emotions of the congregation. It may be urged that emotion needs education; it is peculiarly true with hymns, as we have tried to shew, that good art in the long run will hold its own: that good art has an educative power, and bad art a limiting power. If the Italian peasant’s conception of heavenly beauty is expressed by a figure of our Lady in black velvet holding a lace handkerchief, the conception once realized before his eyes may then have a stunting effect upon his mind. But all these general propositions being granted, it still remains true that a hymn-book cannot satisfactorily be compiled without more reference to the tastes of the congregation than some compilers seem willing to give. ‘Let me make the proverbs, and who will may make the laws,’ is a judgement which, *mutatis mutandis*, might be said of hymns. But it is no good to make proverbs unless people want to quote them, nor to make hymns unless people want to sing them. ‘The whole people is singing itself into this Lutheran doctrine,’ was said at the time of the Reformation, but then people did want to sing Luther’s hymns.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See an article, ‘Romance of Hymnology’ in *The Interpreter* (Jan. 1905).



Of the books before us the *Public School Hymn-Book* seems to have been compiled most definitely and successfully with a view to the tastes of the congregation. The hymns as a whole are strong, simple, and poetical; Palgrave's 'O thou not made with hands' has not been thought too visionary, nor 'Though we long, in sin-wrought blindness,' too 'experienced' and subjective; and many stirring hymns, though of less poetical power than the foregoing, by Skrine, Buckoll, Walsham How, and others, are added to those better known. In fact, the compilers seem to have considered carefully what kind of hymns would stir the minds of boys to a strong and wholesome religious mood, and to have formed their collection on this principle.

The *Hampshire Hymn-Book for Children*, too, has been formed not only to improve but to please, to give the children something which they would enjoy singing. Here, however, that most intolerant tolerance, undenominationalism, has made the task difficult. It is probably, for instance, the verses about Baptism which have led to the exclusion of such a hymn as 'Christ, who once amongst us,' or Mrs. Alexander's beautiful words 'In the rich man's garden ground.' The whole question of children's hymns is a difficult one, and we do not feel that the principle of selection has been finally solved. Very often children prefer and rightly prefer (as in other matters) hymns which are meant for older people, especially if they are vivid and high-sounding; whereas the hymns usually meant for children are full of just the kind of allusions to their littleness and weakness which insult the best aspirations of childhood. However, in spite of such aberrations as

'I often say my prayers,  
But do I ever pray?  
. . . .  
'Tis useless to implore,  
Unless I feel I need;  
Unless 'tis from a sense of want  
That all my prayers proceed.'<sup>1</sup>

and a few hymns too mature for children, this collection is a

<sup>1</sup> *H. H. B.* 85.

good one, and it is a pity that the alphabetical system adopted has caused it to begin with two of the weakest lines in the book :

' A little ship was on the sea,  
It was a pretty sight.'

The *Methodist Hymn-Book* was formed on a totally different principle from that which we have been discussing. It was not formed by collecting from different sources hymns to suit the capacities of a special class of worshippers : it is a hymn-book written in bulk by two of the finest English hymn-writers at the time of one of the greatest outbursts of spontaneous hymnody. The difference in the greatness of touch is apparent from the first moment that one opens the book. No anxious nor patronizing hand has been at work, pruning off, and tying down, from the pages where Watts proclaims :

' God is a name my soul adores,'<sup>1</sup>

or Charles Wesley cries

' Pierce, fill me with a humble fear.'<sup>2</sup>

What compiler could have allowed to pass into a new collection anything so daring as this verse?—

' Here, as in the lion's den,  
Undevoured we still remain ;  
Pass secure the watery flood,  
*Hanging on the arm of God ;*  
Here we raise our voices higher,  
Shout in the refiner's fire,  
Clap our hands amidst the flame,  
Glory give to Jesu's name.'<sup>3</sup>

There is a virile strength about the very defects, as when Watts dilates on 'the sprightly man, or warlike horse,' or is 'amazed' at

' the strange design  
To save rebellious worms.'

which leaves us more amazed than amused.

The arrangers of the new edition have been very wise.

<sup>1</sup> *M. H.* 37.

<sup>2</sup> *M. H.* 446.

<sup>3</sup> *M. H.* 18.

They have left the great bulk unaltered ; have admitted one, as it were, to Charles Wesley's studio to see his various delineations of the same subject, occasionally repeating almost the same phrase, as in 600, 601 ; they have even sometimes allowed us to see (as in 570, 571) how one of John Wesley's translations has given Charles an idea which he has himself worked out in a hymn of his own. Many of the best popular hymns contained in well-known collections have been added to the original book, and careful search has been made among the poets. Thus the whole collection is one which is evidently acceptable to the average congregation, and yet will impress the mind of an intellectual man with the sense that he is following religious thought into regions far beyond his comprehension, not joining with a shamefaced kindliness in doggerel sentimentalism, presumably liked by women and children. He can read such verses as :

' Still restless nature dies and grows,  
From change to change the creatures run :  
Thy being no succession knows,  
And all Thy vast designs are one.'<sup>1</sup>

or :

' Great God ! on what a slender thread  
Hang everlasting things :'

with a feeling that religion touches the real world, and things more real still beyond the world. The book is one which could be taken to meditate upon ; it is intended, as we see, for this use as well as for general and private gatherings. In the exquisite strong resignation of Anne Brontë's verses, ' I hoped that with the brave and strong' ; in the mysteries hidden in such lines as :

' None but Thy Wisdom knows Thy Might,  
None but Thy Word can speak Thy Name.'<sup>2</sup>

or :

' The sons of ignorance and night  
May dwell in the eternal Light  
Through the eternal Love.'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *M. H.* 37.

<sup>2</sup> *M. H.* 37.

<sup>3</sup> *M. H.* 51.

in such inward petitions as :

‘Unfathomable depths Thou art ;  
O plunge me in Thy mercy’s sea !  
Void of true wisdom is my heart ;  
With love embrace and cover me.’<sup>1</sup>

in the clear, outflowing spring of Cowper’s verse, and in such spiritual songs as :

‘Break, day of God, O break !’<sup>2</sup>

the heart seems to refresh itself.

What, then, shall we say of the new edition of that great collection which has long, and not undeservedly, held so prominent a place among us—*Hymns Ancient and Modern* ? It has held its place so long, is in the main so fine a collection of hymns, and so well adapted to its purpose, that the revisers must not be surprised if any changes are peculiarly open to attack. Its faults and defects were well known : are they remedied ? Long use had endeared its hymns : omission was sure to be fiercely criticized, especially if, in view of the additions, the omission of any favourite hymns should seem to be wanton.

The compilers of Church hymn-books have a difficult task. They are fettered ; for the hymns must be used in connexion with a definite form of service. Freedom is still more limited if they have any nervous fear of vivid or poetical expressions, or a strong didactic impulse. We think that both these tendencies are more observable in the *Ancient and Modern* collection than in its close competitor, *Church Hymns*. The truth is that the compilers of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* sometimes seem to be under the impression that a hymn can be written, or at any rate translated, by an effort of theological determination. As many people are under the impression that a few obvious remarks, cut up into lines of unequal length, form an epitaph, so others appear to believe that a certain class of technical words, mixed with affected English, forms a satisfactory rendering of Latin ; or that verses embodying well-known facts, useful reflections, and familiar doctrines become a hymn.

<sup>1</sup> *M. H.* 38.

<sup>2</sup> *M. H.* 205.

Now, in the first place, it is difficult to estimate the harm which may be done by the popular use of technical language in religion. The real object of any technical or specialized language is the registration and communication of accurate ideas ; but for popular expression, unless the language is recommended by beauty and dignity, and endeared by association, the use of special terms simply as 'more proper' is almost wholly harmful.

Let us take such a favourite expression of hymn-writers as 'accept our thankful cry.' It is utterly alien to any sort of natural expression ; and the best that anyone can do with it is, so far as possible, to abstract his attention from it. But the habit of abstracting our attention from the things we are uttering is a bad habit, especially in religious matters. Moreover, the fact that we have to do so communicates a sense of unreality which spreads far beyond the bounds of the particular instance. It is a plain fact that people say in technical language what they would not think of saying in plain English, and even in the course of the Church service make statements which would be startling in their intensity when put into simple words. It is true that if the special language used in religious expression is full of beauty and dignity, it has an advantage by raising the mind into a sublimer atmosphere. Yet even here there is loss. 'Hail, festal day,' is a good translation in dignified language, but compare it with 'Welcome, happy morning.' The one must weigh heavy in beauty and dignity to counterbalance the loss of homely reality and the sombre tone which, to the Englishman, too often makes religious enjoyment not the crown of joy, but something wholly alien to human delight.

When technical language indicates impossible actions like 'Glory to the Spirit pour' ; when it raises ludicrous images ; when it is hopelessly conventional, like 'humbly sue' or 'tuneful art' ; when it is a mere misuse of English, like the word 'blend,' which is used for any kind of combination or co-operation ; when it consists of an order of words possible nowhere but in hymns—

'As a temple to Thine honour,  
Us, Thy servants, deign to bless.'

when it is an attempt to convey an archaic touch by means of tortured English, the result is vicious art and deteriorated feeling.

Mediaevalism in religion is no advantage *per se*. Mediaeval hymns, mediaeval architecture, mediaeval devotion, are often of unmeasured value, because in the Middle Ages religion blossomed into art, and because the mediaeval was one of those recurrent periods when the beauty of holiness was so essentially felt and expressed that the results are for all time. But the mere fact that a hymn or anything else is mediaeval has no intrinsic religious value, and a poor translation of an ancient hymn is none the less a bad hymn because the original is old and even in itself beautiful.

In considering the whole question of translation it will be obvious that Latin hymns are the main difficulty. Greek hymns and French hymns are comparatively few, and the correspondence with English forms of words, rhymes, and turns of phrase in German verse makes the translation of German hymns comparatively easy. But in Latin this is not the case, and the Latin hymn must be practically re-written or freely paraphrased. For the essential merit in translation is that the same thing should be as forcibly and beautifully said in the new as in the original language. A beautiful, poetical hymn must be rendered by another beautiful and poetical hymn. Exact correspondence of expressions is good so far as possible, but it is not always possible. Identity of metre may be sometimes an added grace; so is a fine flavour of the language from which the translation is made.

Let us take an almost perfect translated hymn which yet is not a perfect translation, 'Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire.' Exactness has been sacrificed, as it ought to be, to the first main object, the re-rendering of the great idea in a beautiful hymn. The original metre has been preserved, and such a line as 'Enable with perpetual light' gives quite exquisitely the Latin flavour to a line which is essentially English; that is to say it emphasizes delicately the Latin element in English. In this respect the hymn is much better than 'Come, Thou Holy Spirit, come,' which is a singularly

accurate rendering, but which loses, by the multiplicity of little words, the sonorous roll of the Latin.

But compare with either of these hymns the compilers'

'Servant of God, remember.'<sup>1</sup>

This may be perfectly accurate, it may be in the same metre as the original, but it suggests a Latin original because no one otherwise could use such uncouth English. It has simply forfeited every element of poetry.

'When on chaste bed thy body  
To slumber thou dost fashion.'

'Yet e'en in sleep the spirit  
Bright thoughts of Christ encloses.'

Here are expressions which are not even tolerable English, and which never could be used except in hymn-writing.

The compilers have not been content with writing poor translations where none hitherto existed, but they have put such bald versification as 'Up, new Jerusalem, and sing' side by side with a vigorous and beautiful song, 'Ye choirs of new Jerusalem.'

'He triumphs glorious with His train,  
And, worthy of His high domain,  
Joins in one commonwealth of love  
Our earthly home and heav'n above.'

is thought preferable to

'Triumphant in His glory now,  
His sceptre ruleth all;  
Earth, heaven, and hell before Him bow,  
And at His footstool fall.'<sup>2</sup>

But even this is tamed in the version given in the present as in the earlier edition of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*.

If Campbell's version were not sufficiently accurate, Neale's 'Thou new Jerusalem on high' is in the required metre. It is not one of Neale's best translations, but it is not so

<sup>1</sup> *A. & M.* 108.

<sup>2</sup> *A. & M.* 141, 140.



prosaic as the compilers' rendering. There were indeed ten translations, already in use, from which the compilers might have chosen.<sup>1</sup>

Or again, Caswall's hymn 'Hark, an awful voice is sounding' (already altered by the first compilers), which ought to run, as *Church Hymns* more accurately gives it :

'Startled at the solemn warning,  
Let the earth-bound soul arise;  
Christ, her Sun, all sloth dispelling,  
Shines upon the morning skies,'<sup>2</sup>

has for alternative in *Hymns Ancient and Modern* :

'Now let th' enfeebled soul arise,  
That in the dust all wounded lies;  
To banish sin and heal distress  
Comes forth the Sun of Righteousness.'<sup>3</sup>

The revisers of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* have not feared, they tell us, 'to perpetuate improvements, nor even deliberately to make changes with this practical end in view.' Indeed, their courage sometimes strikes us as positively heroic. Whereas one might have hoped that some grace would have been restored to translations from which the earlier compilers, line by line, and verse by verse, had filched the poetry, the revisers seem with leaden finger to have reduced them to even more unmistakeable prose. 'Rightful Prince of Martyrs thou' had become 'First of Martyrs, thou whose name'<sup>4</sup>; but now the last lines—

'Prince of Martyrs, thee behind  
What a countless army wind'

are flattened down even below this mediocre level to

'First, but after thee shall press  
Ranks of martyrs numberless.'

Again, we suppose that both here and in another hymn it was thought that the use of 'divine' must be much more

<sup>1</sup> See Julian's *Dictionary of Hymnology*.    <sup>2</sup> C. H. 76, cf. A. & M. 46.

<sup>3</sup> A. & M. 45.

<sup>4</sup> A. & M. 68.

carefully guarded. And hence the revisers have 'perpetuated the improvement' which had toned down the verse

'Like a gem each rugged stone  
Sparkling with thy life-blood shone;  
Nor could stars more brightly shine,  
Studded round thy head divine'

to

'Bright the stones which bruise thee gleam,  
Sprinkled with thy life-blood's stream;  
Stars around thy sainted head  
Such a radiance could not shed.'

while, since Caswall's enthusiasm must be suppressed, the verse

'Pure Saint ! upon his Saviour's breast  
Invited to recline,  
'Twas thence he drew in moments blest  
His knowledge all divine :

becomes

'*Upon the Saviour's loving breast  
Permitted to recline ;  
'Twas thence he drew in moments blest  
Rich stores of truth divine.*'<sup>1</sup>

A tiresome pedantry has marred Chandler's hymn 'In stature grows the heavenly Child' again by the careful elimination of the word 'parents,' and has produced the line 'A simple carpenter' (rhyming with 'bear'), where the stress upon the last syllable produces an effect displeasingly ludicrous.

This brings us to a final question : How far has anyone a right so to alter hymns? We remember John Wesley's fierce words (it is a pity that this fine preface has been omitted in the *Methodist Hymn-Book*) :

'Many gentlemen have done my brother and me (though without naming us) the honour to reprint many of our hymns. Now, they are perfectly welcome so to do, provided they print them just as they are. But I desire they would not attempt to mend them ; for they really are not able. None of them is able to mend either the sense or the verse.'

<sup>1</sup> *A. & M.* 69.

It is laughable to talk of early pious frauds as the work of those whose standard of literary honesty was childish as compared with our own, when any company of compilers feel at liberty to alter the sense, the words, and the rhyme to suit their own taste and cautious view of what it is safe to say; and no editor, as Roundell Palmer tells us,<sup>1</sup> not even Wesley in spite of his preface, is wholly free from the reproach.

Some editorial work there must be, for many of the finest hymns are too long for singing; some alterations may be necessary, even from the fact that words change their meaning and character: 'charming' and 'pompous' cannot always be used as Wesley and Watts used them. But on the whole, if compilers would leave more of the responsibility of writing hymns to their authors, and more of the responsibility of the proportion in which they are used to those who use them, they would have greater energy to spare for their own appropriate task of collecting, classifying, and restoring.

It becomes almost ludicrous to remember the amount of feeling which has been shewn on the subject of the 'welkin' in Charles Wesley's Christmas hymn, which is only one among many points that might have been raised. If the word 'welkin' was re-inserted against so much opposition, why were not the enfeebled lines of the great hymn 'Hail the day' restored to something of their old splendour? 'Pompous triumph' might not have been possible, but the majesty of the hymn is greatly marred by the want of such expressions as 'wide unfold the radiant scene' and 're-ascends His native heaven.' Why is there such a tendency to reduce Wesley to words of one syllable? Here, as in very many other cases, *Church Hymns*, which contains a very great proportion of the same hymns, is far nearer to the original than the *Ancient and Modern* collection, though the *Methodist Hymn-Book* alone has the full flavour of the original.

In their timidity about strong poetical expressions the revisers of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* are too apt to omit

<sup>1</sup> *Book of Praise.*

the culminating flash of hope in a hymn, whether the beginning breaks out triumphantly as in

'Come, let us join our friends above  
That have obtained the prize,  
And on the eagle wings of love  
To joys celestial rise.'<sup>1</sup>

or whether the aspiration is completed with a touch of immortal vitality :

'Or if on joyful wing,  
Cleaving the sky,  
Sun, moon and stars forgot,  
Upwards I fly.'<sup>2</sup>

—which is a touch of real poetry in a hymn otherwise rather of the sentimental order.

Conventionalism has been the Procrustes of hymns—anything a little unusual is apt to be docked. The hymn already quoted is a peculiarly striking instance of mutilation, and the comparison is well worth study. The original ran

'Ten thousand to their endless home  
This solemn moment fly ;  
And we are to the margin come,  
And we expect to die.'

All this is altered, and the next lines are omitted

'His militant embodied host,  
With wistful<sup>3</sup> looks we stand ;  
And long to see that happy coast,  
And reach that heavenly land.'

After what we have already seen of the methods of 'revision' we could not hope to include :

'Even now by faith we join our hands  
With those that went before ;  
And greet the blood-besprinkled bands  
On the eternal shore.'

<sup>1</sup> *M. H.* 805 ; *C. H.* 379 retains this verse but has altered much else.

<sup>2</sup> 'Nearer, my God, to Thee.'

<sup>3</sup> Or 'wishful' (*Book of Praise*).

If the revisers would translate with the same freedom with which they alter there might be more English in their renderings.

It is quite in vain to multiply instances in which alteration or omission has been made apparently for the express purpose of making a hymn more ordinary. Sometimes its whole character is changed. For instance the hymn which expresses so finely Christian endurance, a hymn suitable for those whom the Methodist would call 'Experienced Christians'—

'Much in sorrow, oft in woe,  
Onward, Christians, onward go;  
Fight the fight, and, worn with strife,  
Steep with tears the Bread of Life.'

has now been made into a kind of rollicking march for the use of bright Sunday-faced children, and the revisers have not attempted to restore it. Why should our Scottish brethren, to whom 'O God of Bethel' is almost a national anthem (though indeed they have themselves adopted some later alterations), still be vexed by 'O God of Jacob'? Why are some of the most beautiful verses of 'Abide with me' and two of the five precious verses of 'Jesu, lover of my soul,' not even given for optional use?<sup>1</sup> Why is Faber's hymn 'Jesu, gentlest Saviour,' made into a hymn of private interpretation by omission of the cosmic touch?

'Nature cannot hold thee,  
Heaven is all too strait  
For Thine endless glory  
And Thy royal state.

Out beyond the shining  
Of the furthest star,  
Thou art ever stretching,  
Infinitely far.'

The 'pious fraud,' if we choose to call it so, has one specially interesting type, viz. the imitative hymn which sometimes retains a verse or verses of the original. Thus

<sup>1</sup> *M. H.* includes four verses.

Matthew Bridge's mystical hymn 'Crown him with many crowns' has, with the retention of the first verse, been rewritten in a straightforward theological spirit by Thring, and various combinations of the two may be met with. But the most striking history of alteration is in the case of the hymn 'Jerusalem, my happy home.' This hymn, as we have it in all the collections before us, is the comparatively tame imitation of the Eckington collection, not always quite correctly given; and all the sweet fancies, the gardens and gallant walks, the ivory houses and crystal casements, the musk and civet of the original are omitted.

Now it is impossible to say that this is never allowable; but the real authorship ought to be made abundantly clear in the indexing. Yet, for some inexplicable reason, the two standard Church hymn-books seem to treat the question of authorship as if it were of little interest to the congregation. *Additional Hymns* gives the author after the hymn; the *Public School Hymn-Book* gives not only this but the author's date; the Methodist book, even in the copies without tunes, has an admirable system of indexing, and gives a list of authors with certain main facts. But to look up the authorship of any particular hymn from the list of authors in the small tune-book of *Ancient and Modern* or *Church Hymns* is a task which consumes time, and bristles with vexatious difficulties. Is it supposed to be unadvisable to know that one is singing a hymn by Bernard of Clairvaux or John Newton? Or is it thought, untruly, to be uninteresting to most people, or simply of no importance?

Yet even in the latter case care should be taken that the ascription is correct. Now, while the *Methodist Hymn-Book* assigns its version of 'Jerusalem, my happy home,' correctly to the Eckington collection, and the *Public School Hymn-Book* with great probability ascribes it to Montgomery, the *Ancient and Modern* book gives the author as 'F. B.'; but 'F. B. P.'s' original was a far more delicate and imaginative poem. Nor is this the only case of incorrect ascription of authorship. Nos. 494 and 614 (*A. & M.*) are given as John Wesley's hymns, though they are in reality both translations, one from Scheffler and one from Tersteegen.

The truth is that these defects shew how comparatively little weight is attached to the literary side of the hymns.

It seems to amount to positive fatuity when really beautiful Saint's-day hymns like Isaac Williams' 'Fear no more' and 'How happy the mortal' are omitted from both the *A. & M.* and *Church Hymns*, and we are introduced by the former to verses which attempt to apply lessons from the life of that very indefinite person, St. George, to our own day,<sup>1</sup> or find ourselves expected by the latter actually to sing

'Jude bids us for the holy faith  
With fervent zeal to fight,  
And zeal shines brightly in thy name,  
Simon the Canaanite.'<sup>2</sup>

We are glad to notice in the *A. & M.* hymn-book that for many Saints' days we are referred to more general hymns for apostles, martyrs, or evangelists. It is surely more edifying to sing general hymns with a special reference—the principle, after all, on which our Old Testament lessons are chosen—than to inform ourselves in doggerel of facts or fancies about saints.

The *A. & M.* revisers regret, among other things, the paucity of baptismal hymns; yet neither this book nor *Church Hymns* has so good a special section as the *Methodist Hymn-Book*; and it is a culpable oversight that Charles Wesley's 'Lord of all, with pure intent,' and Miss Winkworth's translation, 'Blessed Jesus,' should not have been included.

*Church Hymns* has no group of mission hymns; the section in *A. & M.* is a good one, though some beautiful hymns are omitted, *e.g.* Bonar's 'In a land of sorrow,' Doddridge's 'Oh happy day,' and the simple and dramatic 'There were ninety and nine.' Yet it may perhaps be questioned whether it is not better for a congregation generally to have, at the time of a mission, a book new to them, rather than to use mission hymns out of their own book. This was probably the view of the compilers of *Church Hymns*.

It would be difficult to find any group of hymns of more

<sup>1</sup> *A. & M.* 247.

<sup>2</sup> *C. H.* 226.



completeness and beauty on the whole than the Communion hymns in the *A. & M.* We are glad to see that 'I hunger and I thirst' has been added, though we still regret the omission of Bonar's 'Here, oh, my Lord,' and Montgomery's 'According to Thy gracious word.'

The revisers express their regret that few writers have been inspired by the social and national aspects of Christianity; but *Additional Hymns*, intended primarily to supplement this as well as other books, has made one of its good points here by the inclusion of the *Recessional*. It is curious that while 'Crossing the Bar,' a poem whose defects and beauties alike render it unsuitable for a hymn, has been several times included in hymn-books, this poetical prayer of Mr. Kipling's, in metre, in idea, sometimes in phrase strongly reminding us of Watts' paraphrase of the twentieth Psalm (for 'A day of prayer in time of war'), has been included in only one of the collections before us. Indeed, its poetry is the only objection; our interest is perhaps a little too powerfully affected by 'reeking tube and iron shard.' But why is the paraphrase to which we have referred not itself used in this connexion, when the professed object of Dr. Watts was to 'make (the Psalmist) speak the common-sense and language of a Christian'?

Again, the revisers of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* regret that

'hymn-writers have not been much drawn to some subjects which might well have occupied their attention. It is often urged as an objection to Christian hymn-books, that so great a proportion of the hymns contained in them are addressed to our Blessed Lord, rather than to the Father to Whom He brings us. The defect lies largely with the composers of our hymns, and not with the compilers of the collection.'

Now—in view of the omission of many such hymns as the first part of the *Methodist Hymn-Book* contains, but especially of some of the finest paraphrases, such as 'Call Jehovah thy salvation,' 'God, our hope and help abiding,' 'O God, thou art my God alone'—we cannot concur that the defect does not lie with the compilers. Even the old

alteration of 'Guide me, O thou great Jehovah,' to 'Guide me, O thou Great Redeemer,' has been retained.

But is the defect in the composers at all? We come back to the question as to whether hymns are a branch of art. Is the existence of the large proportion of pictures of the Madonna and Child merely due to lack of imagination on the part of religious painters? It may surely be held that every great fact or truth is not equally a subject for artistic representation or expression. Even though it is the case, on certain broad lines, that a general want of proportion at any one time may be signalized, *e.g.*, by an undue proportion of subjective hymns, or by a conspicuous absence of some other class of hymns, this is not so much because hymn-writers have not 'turned their attention' to certain subjects as because the general level of feeling in certain directions is low. Undoubtedly the paucity and poverty of religious art in England is due to some defect in religious feeling generally; but it would not be remedied by our artists 'turning their attention' to religious subjects.

In fact, in repudiating the formation of an anthology as their object, the revisers may be rejecting also the method which would best bring them to their end: to begin by forming an anthology, that is, to collect the best hymns and classify them according to occasion and subjects, would, we think, result in a worthier hymn-book than to begin by collecting, writing, or re-writing a sufficient number of hymns for each particular occasion. It would be necessary delicately to prune such an anthology or carefully to add to it; but this would not imply the tinkering and carpentering, destroying and rebuilding of the second method of collection. It is most unsafe to confuse editorial with constructive work.

Doctrine must, of course, be a regulative principle in forming a hymn-book: just as through artistic representation certain ideas as to the stations of the Cross come to be believed in as historic fact, so some subjective expression of individual feeling may be crystallized into a doctrine; and such a thought as that expressed in the lines (*Add. H.* 819):

'Yet, in the midst of the torture and shame,  
Jesus, the Crucified, breathes my name,'

may be taken as the expression of a definite, if not literal, truth. But though, when a great doctrine possesses the national mind, it is certain to find expression in hymns as elsewhere, yet it must be realized that the simple, intellectual apprehension of doctrine will not enable a man to write a hymn.

On the whole we rejoice to mark a general desire to search again through the copious stores of our older English hymn-writers, and to attempt to make use of modern religious poets, as well as to revive the use of ancient hymns. Yet we cannot but feel that in all these ways accomplishment falls very far short of intention.

As regards the first source—English hymns and paraphrases already in use—we are surprised at many omissions which it would be difficult to classify; in addition to those already mentioned, we may perhaps note such widely different instances as the rare, aromatic verse of Hopkins' 'O fairest of all men,' or Philip Sidney's<sup>1</sup> 'How good and how beseeching well'; Newton's touching 'Quiet, Lord, my froward heart;'; and a modern simple hymn of some intimate power, 'O Love that wilt not let me go'—only one of which is included in any of the collections before us.<sup>2</sup>

But the melancholy fact stares one in the face that the revival of ancient hymns is, on the whole, a great failure from the literary point of view. *Church Hymns*, however, in its 'Hymns of the Ancient Church,' which, if not always poetical, are as a rule honest English verse, has, we feel, done much better than *Hymns Ancient and Modern* in its attempts at fresh translation and revision.

Finally, in the use of religious poetry we are conscious that we have not yet quite arrived at the true principle of discrimination. We make a general plea for a greater elasticity and a finer perception. If art is not to be separated from religion, the artistic spirit must be allowed much more freedom. The divorce of art from religion is an intensely serious thing; beauty and power are lost to both.

The field of hymnology is one in which we can see on a

<sup>1</sup> More correctly by Mary Sidney (Countess of Pembroke).

<sup>2</sup> *Add. H.* 908, 'O Love that wilt not let me go.'

small scale the evil fruit of this dissidence. Who can say that the fault lies wholly on the side of art, when religious thought may not express itself in terms of beauty and delight, but is cramped into old modes of thought, stereotyped expression, and forced to use a horrible decoction of speech, distilled from the stiffest elements of poetical and technical language, and joined to a slovenly sentimentalism? If it had not been for the ponderous idea that hymns must literally reflect theology or fact, we should not have seen the strange spectacle of a man like Sir Oliver Lodge gravely dissecting the language of a hymn, as if there were no question of artistic representation.

The object of a hymn, indeed, is not the furtherance of art, but the effect produced on the soul by means of art—an effect produced through emotion controlled by proportionate thought. Surely it is on account of the emotional effect that hymns are added to our forms of worship. True religious art is itself both the product and the cause of the highest feeling and the finest thought; but art arbitrarily endeavouring to be religious does not express the highest feeling; and religion trying to accommodate art to itself issues in unnatural and stunting expression. Good art, if it is sufficiently simple, gives on the whole the widest, most enduring, and most intelligible expression to religious emotion.

An old canon of Windsor, we are told, who at the time of the Commonwealth assembled the disbanded choir to practise Church music, was asked by the colonel in charge why he could not be content without Popish music; to which he replied 'that he conceived God was as well pleased to be served in tune as out of tune.'<sup>1</sup> So too we should urge that the praise of God is not more worthily rendered by halting verse and conventional phrases; but that forms of literary beauty afford a sublimer and a truer expression for the worship of simple hearts.

<sup>1</sup> *Fasti Etonenses*, by A. C. Benson.

ART. IV.—CLASSIC CHRISTIAN ART : THE  
MOSAICS OF S. MARIA MAGGIORE.

*The Golden Age of Classic Christian Art.* By JEAN PAUL  
RICHTER and A. CAMERON TAYLOR. (London :  
Duckworth and Co., 1904.)

AMONG the greater basilicas of Rome none is more attractive than S. Maria Maggiore. While the proportions and rich warmth of its interior give it a charm which is lacking to more pretentious structures, it is also an eminent example of that historical continuity which gives such interest to the older Roman churches. The outline of the original basilica, with its unequalled series of ancient marble columns, still survives ; and the mediæval mosaics of the apse, the exquisite reliefs of Mino, and the marble decorations of the Borghese and Sistine chapels, are respectively masterpieces of the art and taste of successive ages. But there is one feature of the interior which attracts but little attention from the visitor,—the series of mosaic pictures filling the panels below the line of windows in the nave, and extending over the face of the great arch which enframes the apse and sanctuary. The stranger reads that they are of early date and represent scenes from the Old and New Testaments, and then in nine cases out of ten he passes on to some other object of interest. The reason is the simple one that the pictures from their size and position are practically invisible. On one occasion, indeed, in the year it is possible to obtain a better view. One of the great festivals of the basilica is Christmas, and those who have been present will not forget the scene in the nave, decorated in the style which has become traditional in the Roman churches, where hundreds of wax lights in crystal chandeliers diffuse their warm radiance over the red damask hangings. The atmosphere of light thus created has been intensified of late by the introduction of electricity—with some sacrifice it must be confessed of the artistic effect—which reveals with more or less clearness the dusky figures of the panels in the nave and the somewhat more prominent compositions of the chancel arch. But the crowds which at

such times through the pavement of the church make a regular inspection inconvenient, if not impossible; and the authors of the sumptuous volume which we have placed at the head of this article are guilty of no exaggeration when they write:

‘Riddled with restoration, placed high, practically out of sight, encrusted with dust, these antique mosaics “tell” as dark rectangular patches in the midst of gold and white baroque mouldings, which seem purposely designed to place them at a disadvantage; it is not surprising that in a city which is a mine of more accessible treasures they have heretofore won but a cursory glance, even from art-lovers.’<sup>1</sup>

In these circumstances the study of the mosaics had been based almost entirely on a series of seventeenth-century water-colour copies, which have recently passed from the Barberini Library to that of the Vatican. These were indifferently reproduced in Ciampini’s ‘*Vetera Monumenta*,’ and, with somewhat greater care, in modern times in the ‘*Storia dell’Arte Cristiana*’ of Garrucci, and the ‘*Musaici*’ of De Rossi. Originally there were fifteen panels on either side of the nave, and since most of these contained two scenes, the number of subjects was about sixty. The latter, which are generally but not invariably obvious, are taken from the lives of Abraham, Jacob, Moses, and Joshua (somewhat unequally distributed), the two former occupying the left side of the nave as one faces the altar, and the two latter the right side. At the end of the sixteenth and early in the seventeenth century an important structural addition was made to the basilica by the erection of the so-called Sistine and Borghese chapels, forming quasi-transepts; and as the arches by which they open on the nave cut the architrave and clerestory of the latter, the mosaic panels which occupied the interval (three in each case) were destroyed. Of the former, belonging to the story of Moses, copies were made, but not of the latter, with part of the story of Abraham. There are other cases in which scenes or panels have disappeared without any record being preserved of the subjects which they contained; and it need scarcely be added that in the course of centuries every

<sup>1</sup> *Golden Age*, etc., p. 43.

picture has been subjected to more or less of restoration. But, such as they are, there still survive some forty-three scenes in the nave, to which must be added the six subjects, connected with the Birth and Infancy of our Lord, which occupy the face of the chancel arch.

We are by no means completely informed as to the origin of the basilica. Tradition, which is not apt to minimize the antiquity of such foundations, does not push its date further back than the middle of the fourth century, and so far agrees with that primary source of information about the Roman churches, the *Liber Pontificalis*, where it appears for the first time as the work of Pope Liberius, and known by his name. Almost immediately after this 'Basilica Liberii' is described by a contemporary secular writer, who is likely to have used the commonest designation, as the 'Basilica Sicinini.'<sup>1</sup> The theory has therefore been generally adopted in modern times—and the authors of the present work are in full agreement with it—that Liberius adapted an existing basilica, known for some reason as that of Sicininus, to the purposes of Christian worship.<sup>2</sup>

After the lapse of nearly a century, Xystus III. (432-440) rehabilitated or otherwise restored the basilica; and since it was no longer the fashion to call churches by the names of their founders, it was dedicated to the Virgin—the second instance of the kind in Rome, S. Maria Antiqua being no doubt the first.<sup>3</sup> Hitherto we have not heard a word about the mosaics, nor does the *Liber Pontificalis* in its account of the restoration of Xystus allude to them. But we know that above the principal entrance he placed a dedicatory inscription, the last remains of which disappeared at the end of the sixteenth century, though it had been copied long before. Its opening line is familiar to students of Christian antiquities:

'Virgo Maria tibi Xystus nova templa dicavi'

<sup>1</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus, xxvii. 3, 13.

<sup>2</sup> This receives some confirmation from the statement in the *Gesta Liberii*, probably referring to the same building, that Liberius built an apse, i.e. the characteristic addition which would convert a rectangular secular basilica into a Christian church.

<sup>3</sup> Owing to its size and importance it was called, not as might have been expected, S. Maria Nova, but S. Maria Maior.



and it is clear that it is intended to describe a composition, doubtless in mosaic, in which a central group of the Virgin-Mother and the Divine Child was approached by two processions of martyrs carrying their crowns, with the emblems of their Passions beneath their feet. The well-known mosaics in S. Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna will at once occur to the mind as an illustration of the same idea, though their position, occupying the length of the nave, is different. It is clear that in S. Maria Maggiore there is nothing in existence corresponding to the description; and since there is no room for them in the nave clerestory, where (as Dr. Richter correctly points out) the line of windows was originally continuous, we must suppose that they occupied the only vacant space, viz. that above the entrance wall of the church facing the altar, where in fact the inscription relating to them was to be found. This again implies that the remaining wall-surfaces of the nave—what we have described as the clerestory and chancel arch—were already decorated, and left Xystus no choice of position. His inscription is complete and precise, and contains no reference to the Old Testament scenes of the architrave or the New Testament episodes of the arch. In the centre, indeed, of the latter, and over the keystone of the arch, appear the words, 'Xystus Episcopus plebi Dei,' but they are so obviously an interpolation, alluding solely to the general restoration of the church as a place of worship, that they are in fact an evidence of the pre-existence of the mosaics in which they are embedded. In these circumstances it has been usual with writers to suggest that the Old Testament scenes at least may be the work of Liberius. The pictures of the arch, on the strength of the inscription just referred to, have often been attributed to Xystus by those who have not recognized the interpolation; but, to give no other reasons, Dr. Richter's demonstration of the artistic and technical unity of both Old and New Testament series disposes of any such idea.

Everyone nowadays is familiar with the revolution which, during the last quarter of a century, scientific criticism has worked in our knowledge of Italian art; and it must never be forgotten, amidst its ruthless exposure of spurious

and unfounded reputations, how many hidden treasures it has brought to light and exhibited to our admiration. The secret of its success has been the principle of allowing pictures (for that is the field in which it has been specially active) to tell their own story. Strip it of the false air given by baseless tradition or later restoration, test it by the standards of comparison and quality, and the panel or canvas will answer any reasonable question as to its authorship and date. Documentary evidence, where it is available, will be found in the long run perfectly consistent with the verdict of criticism, but no written statement can alter that verdict when the tale told by the picture is clear and precise.

It is by the application of similar principles that Dr. Richter and his colleague have endeavoured to reach the secret of the mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore. It is scarcely necessary to add that they would be of little avail in the hands of an observer not properly qualified for the task, or that Dr. Richter at least does possess the necessary qualifications in an eminent degree. The combination of a comprehensive knowledge of Christian art from its emergence in ancient times to its culmination in the Renaissance with the reputation of one of the first connoisseurs in Europe, could not fail to be productive of much of the highest interest and value when applied to a problem of this kind. Moreover, Dr. Richter's studies of late years have been specially directed towards the older Christian art, generally designated as Byzantine, and his experience is therefore peculiarly adapted to deal with works such as the mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore, which have been generally ascribed to the earlier phases of that development. The public has not had the same opportunity of estimating the capacities of Miss Taylor, but the confidence reposed in her by Dr. Richter may of itself be regarded as a sufficient testimonial to her merits. While it may be allowed that partnerships of this kind involve a certain amount of subordination in one of the parties, there can be little doubt that, granted adequate knowledge, sympathy, and not less independence, two minds and two pairs of eyes are likely to be more effective than one. In this case we can only congratulate the authors on the success of their

alliance and the harmony of their work. If, for the sake of brevity, we refer to Dr. Richter alone, it will be understood that this is done with a full appreciation of the share in those results which is contributed by his colleague.

The first thing to be done was to examine the mosaics themselves. We have already pointed out that, owing to their inaccessibility, previous studies were largely based on copies; and it was mainly owing to these difficulties that Garrucci and De Rossi did comparatively little to settle the question of date. It was a Russian, Professor Ainalof, who some ten years ago, first examined the pictures close at hand so far as circumstances would permit. But he had no special appliances for prolonged study, and, valuable as his results may be—they are conveniently given in an Appendix to the present volume—he was scarcely able to examine the material with the same minute attention which has now been bestowed upon it. Nevertheless it was a hopeful sign that the method of questioning the pictures face to face was productive of one important advance beyond the conclusions of previous investigators, viz. the proof of the identity in style and date (which he places in the fifth century) of the mosaics of both arch and nave. It was the permission, as we understand it, to employ for the first time mechanical appliances on a considerable scale which enabled Dr. Richter and his colleague to make a satisfactory survey of every portion of the surface of the representations. They describe the sanction given by the Chapter for

'the erection of scaffoldings (disfiguring, and sometimes inconvenient, though they were), for limited and intermitting periods of time; or, when this was not feasible, to permit us to be let down through the ceiling in a cage, and to continue our work thus suspended before the object of our studies.'<sup>1</sup>

The results, which, as the authors say, are 'surprising,' must be described as shortly as possible, and in their own words. From the mass of restorations, inevitable in the course of so many centuries, but 'sometimes so extensive and repeated that the picture in which they occur is reduced to

<sup>1</sup> Preface, p. vi.

the level of a badly preserved copy,' it is possible to distinguish fragments 'and once an entire picture' which may claim to be called original, and can alone be taken into account in settling the question of date.<sup>1</sup> Considerations both of style and of technique coincide in suggesting not the fifth but the second or third century. Not only are the pictures as a whole 'classic in conception and composition,' but our attention is specially drawn to 'the brilliantly impressionistic execution of some of the best-preserved heads, which are of a daring cleverness inconceivable at so late a date as the second quarter of the fifth century.'<sup>2</sup> Their artistic affinities are not with the mosaics of S. Pudenziana or of S. Sabina, but with reliefs of the time of Marcus Aurelius and Septimius Severus. And when their subject-matter comes to be examined it is found to be consistent with the artistic evidence. The point of view from which the episodes, whether of the Gospel history on the arch or of the Old Testament in the nave, are regarded, is not that of the Christian thinkers of the fourth and fifth century, of Augustine and Jerome, but of those of the second and third, of Justin Martyr and Origen. The subject-matter of the pictures in the nave, we are told,

'consists of scenes to which especial importance was attached by early theologians as being occultly prophetic of the life and doctrines of Christ. The manner in which these incidents are represented is deeply tinged by animosity against the Jews, who are pictured as a people whose perversity estranged the favour of God, and who were superseded by a spiritual "plebs Dei," the Church of Christ.'<sup>3</sup>

In the fifth century, on the other hand, 'the Jews played no rôle in Christian thought.'<sup>4</sup> And the same train of ideas is to be found in the scenes on the arch.<sup>5</sup> In short, the mosaics belong, artistically, to the age of the Antonines, and not to that of the dynasty of Theodosius; or, to state it in the terms of ecclesiastical history, to the age of the Apologists and not to the age of the Councils. Moreover, to make the argument complete, the building in which they are enshrined belongs to the same epoch, and whether it were the basilica forming part of the palace of some Christian noble, or were

<sup>1</sup> P. 38.    <sup>2</sup> P. 25.    <sup>3</sup> P. 47.    <sup>4</sup> P. 88.    <sup>5</sup> Cf. P. 374.

actually used as a place of worship, we must suppose that it was decorated with these compositions about the same period. That they survived the persecution of Diocletian is not more surprising than that the mosaics of S. Sophia are still intact behind the plaster and whitewash which conceals them.

To state these conclusions is sufficiently startling without insisting on their novelty and interest. It is notorious that we are but indifferently informed about the Christianity of what may be called the Second Age, that which separates the Apostolic from the Constantinian Church, and covers, roughly speaking, the second and third centuries. The literature is fairly copious, in spite of its lacunæ; but for the pictorial representation of Christian ideas we have hardly anything to fall back upon except the somewhat superficial and, if we may use the expression, plebeian art of the Catacombs. The discovery, therefore, that all the while there existed in Rome a Christian basilica of the first rank, belonging to that age, and retaining its pictorial decorations, presumably of a didactic or doctrinal character, would, if established, be of no small importance. Such a monument would be unique, and the information which it conveyed could hardly fail to be extremely valuable.

The proposal to refer the origin of the mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore to the end of the second century is not to be brushed aside by mere assertions of its improbability or impossibility. It is obvious, indeed, that when a theory is seriously propounded by a scholar of Dr. Richter's knowledge and experience, there must be a certain number of facts which support it. To have discovered or to have insisted on such facts not infrequently gives a permanent value to researches which have nevertheless failed, in the opinion of those best qualified to judge, to establish the conclusions which their author would draw from them. Those who are familiar with archæological, or indeed historical, investigations generally are prepared to find a certain amount of incontrovertible evidence brought forward by competent and responsible inquirers in aid of some theory which they seek to prove. The crucial question is always whether such evidence is really conclusive in favour of the theory, and will not be found on

examination to be equally consistent with another view of the facts which is recommended by still weightier considerations. The case clearly rests ultimately on the actual state of the mosaics, and, whatever may be thought of their final conclusions, we have no hesitation in saying that Dr. Richter and his colleague appear to us to have established on scientific and convincing grounds the fundamental distinction between the various strata of restoration, and the fragments, of a striking and consistent character both in style and technique, which belong to the original execution of the designs. This much of their work at least is of permanent value. And we are not merely dependent on the word of observers who, however competent, can hardly, seeing the difficulties of access, be controlled by independent witnesses. A series of facsimiles in colours, executed with all that imitative skill which certain Italian artists possess, practically places us in the presence of the most important fragments of the original work, as well as of typical specimens of those restored portions which it is essential to distinguish from it.<sup>1</sup> Every cube of the mosaic appears on these copies in its original colour and position, and we know of nothing approaching them in value as an object-lesson in the aims and methods of the art of pictorial mosaic. As has been already stated the art is impressionist, and we can here appreciate the wonderful skill with which such unpromising material is made to produce—given the proper lighting and point of view—such broad and realistic effects. The number of cubes employed in *e.g.* a face is extraordinarily small, but each one has its exact and essential value, and is indispensable to the general result. It is instructive to compare the solidity and vitality of the figures in these fragments with the flat and lifeless results of the later restorations, as well as with the painfully elaborate methods of the modern mosaic workers. We cannot do better than allow the authors to describe in their own words the methods and technique of

<sup>1</sup> The water-colour drawings were made by Sig. Tabanelli, who is also responsible for the facsimiles in Wilpert's *Pitture delle Catacombe Romane*, and are reproduced in the three-colour process by Danesi. We may also refer to the equally realistic copies (unpublished) of the wall-paintings in S. Maria Antiqua.

these masterpieces. Let us take as an example the episode of the Passage of the Red Sea where the left of the picture has been but little damaged.

'The figures composing the procession of the Israelites are in good condition; notably fine are those of Moses and Aaron, also the two heads immediately behind them, which are flawless; composed of unalterable vitreous cubes, undimmed and untarnished by time, these present precisely the same appearance as when they left their maker's hands one thousand seven hundred years ago. The technique in which these heads are executed is of a brilliant and audacious impressionism of curiously modern character. The desired effect is obtained solely by the juxtaposition of masses of tone, without any regard to outline. The effect, for instance, of the eye and shining cheek of the young man behind Moses is produced by three square touches, a black and a white cube forming the eye, and a second white cube the high light on the cheek. The faces are richly coloured; the shadows consisting of blue-blacks, and saturated reds and oranges; the lights, of orange, lemon yellow, and white, with connecting passages of neutral tint. These strongly individual notes of colour melt into each other, in the dim light of the church interior, at the distance of some four or five yards.'<sup>1</sup>

We will next place before our readers a passage relating to one of the mosaics of the arch. In the picture of the Annunciation the head of the angel on the right of the Virgin is

'executed in the technique characteristic of the earliest stratum of execution in this church, exception being made of unimportant repairs. This Angel's face is warm in colour, round and full in form, and is framed in flame-like masses of hair; the head is solid, and this effect is obtained not by linear drawing, but by the juxtaposition of masses of tone; high lights of precisely the right value are dashed on to the cheek-bone and upper lip, indicating their form with an audacious certainty of touch which would do credit to a modern impressionist. (Two light cubes form the high light on the cheek-bone and three on the upper lip.) In harmony with this radiant head is the transparent grey-blue halo by which it is encircled.

'In striking contrast to this daringly handled and glowing embodiment of disciplined force is the timidly executed pinched face

<sup>1</sup> P. 176 and plate 20.



of the Virgin, composed of a mass of small, slightly modulated grey-pink cubes, on which the features are drawn in heavy but weak lines. Nothing can be more dissimilar than the technique of these two heads; they are the outcome of ideals and technical methods separated from each other by a wide gulf of time.<sup>1</sup>

There are other significant interpolations besides the head of the Virgin. Her dress was originally white, but 'at some subsequent period the high lights were knocked out, and replaced by gold.'<sup>2</sup> Moreover, the background behind her has been reconstructed with gold cubes, quite at variance with the original treatment. To the ordinary mind there is nothing, probably, more characteristic of mosaic decoration than the use of gold; and the gorgeous effulgence of St. Mark's at Venice is for them typical of the art. Nevertheless gold was foreign to the original colour-scheme in S. Maria Maggiore; it belongs to the decadence, and Dr. Richter has a plausible account of its introduction.

'During the Middle Ages, possibly when the church was darkened by the blocking up of alternate windows of the Nave, eyes accustomed to the glittering surfaces of the Cosmati, or Pre-Cosmati, demanded more brilliance, and the yellow cubes of the middle distance were replaced by vitreous cubes to which actual gold-leaf had been applied.'<sup>3</sup>

The original backgrounds of the pictures may be described as 'aerial.' They have suffered severely, but there are fragments enough left to tell the tale, and we read of the Divine figure appearing above Abraham and Melchizedek in the midst of

'finely observed fiery clouds, with blue-purple shadows, burning on a clear, cold sky; the work of one who not only had felt the beauty of clouds at sunset, but had the power of suggesting it pictorially.'<sup>4</sup>

Or, again, in the scene of the Passage of the Jordan, we are told how

'inimitable in the rendering of tender atmospheric effects are the mountains on the left . . . the *ne plus ultra* of the expression in mosaic of the subtleties of vaporous landscape.'<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> P. 280 and pl. 33.    <sup>2</sup> P. 282.    <sup>3</sup> P. 252.    <sup>4</sup> P. 49 and pl. 6.

<sup>5</sup> P. 217 and pl. 25, 1 (not in colours, and too small to control the description).

Apart from landscape details, which are few, the artist, we read,

'inlaid his foreground figures upon a graduated scheme of melting colours, a synthesis of a spring landscape, an impressionist's recollection of a sunny day in open country. The foreground colours are a heavy green and a heavy red, which pass by rapid but fine gradations into the sun-bathed amber of the middle distance; this gradually sinks into aerial grey-purples, which brighten into the clear pallor of the sky.'<sup>1</sup>

Once, in the scene of the Stoning of Moses, the investigators were fortunate enough to discover an intact portion of the surface, which is

'invaluable as affording a basis for the mental reconstruction of other backgrounds of this cycle. For all incidents represented, together with such landscape details as were necessary to the story, were either silhouetted upon this lovely colour-scale, or woven into it. It should be observed that the yellow of the middle distance is more brilliant than the gold which replaces it in neighbouring pictures.'<sup>2</sup>

There are writers on art in whom language of this kind would arouse the suspicion that some exaggeration or even illusion underlay their descriptions; but Dr. Richter is too experienced a critic to mislead us in this way, and we may accept with confidence his account of the noble style and fine quality of the mosaics. But when we come to compare the facts with the conclusions which are drawn from them we are bound to confess that we are far from feeling the same confidence. As we have already pointed out, it is one thing to observe correctly, and another to establish the position that only one conclusion, excluding all others, can be drawn from those observations. We will endeavour to explain, so far as is possible without the aid of illustrations, what application of this distinction can be made in the case of the mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore and the theories of Dr. Richter.

Before we consider the evidence of the pictures themselves, a few words must be devoted to their architectural setting and the arguments which it suggests. We have no

<sup>1</sup> P. 48.

<sup>2</sup> P. 203 and pl. 24.

of the Virgin, composed of a mass of small, slightly modulated grey-pink cubes, on which the features are drawn in heavy but weak lines. Nothing can be more dissimilar than the technique of these two heads; they are the outcome of ideals and technical methods separated from each other by a wide gulf of time.<sup>1</sup>

There are other significant interpolations besides the head of the Virgin. Her dress was originally white, but 'at some subsequent period the high lights were knocked out, and replaced by gold.'<sup>2</sup> Moreover, the background behind her has been reconstructed with gold cubes, quite at variance with the original treatment. To the ordinary mind there is nothing, probably, more characteristic of mosaic decoration than the use of gold; and the gorgeous effulgence of St. Mark's at Venice is for them typical of the art. Nevertheless gold was foreign to the original colour-scheme in S. Maria Maggiore; it belongs to the decadence, and Dr. Richter has a plausible account of its introduction.

'During the Middle Ages, possibly when the church was darkened by the blocking up of alternate windows of the Nave, eyes accustomed to the glittering surfaces of the Cosmati, or Pre-Cosmati, demanded more brilliance, and the yellow cubes of the middle distance were replaced by vitreous cubes to which actual gold-leaf had been applied.'<sup>3</sup>

The original backgrounds of the pictures may be described as 'aerial.' They have suffered severely, but there are fragments enough left to tell the tale, and we read of the Divine figure appearing above Abraham and Melchizedek in the midst of

'finely observed fiery clouds, with blue-purple shadows, burning on a clear, cold sky; the work of one who not only had felt the beauty of clouds at sunset, but had the power of suggesting it pictorially.'<sup>4</sup>

Or, again, in the scene of the Passage of the Jordan, we are told how

'inimitable in the rendering of tender atmospheric effects are the mountains on the left . . . the *ne plus ultra* of the expression in mosaic of the subtleties of vaporous landscape.'<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> P. 280 and pl. 33.    <sup>2</sup> P. 282.    <sup>3</sup> P. 252.    <sup>4</sup> P. 49 and pl. 6.

<sup>5</sup> P. 217 and pl. 25, 1 (not in colours, and too small to control the description).

Apart from landscape details, which are few, the artist, we read,

'inlaid his foreground figures upon a graduated scheme of melting colours, a synthesis of a spring landscape, an impressionist's recollection of a sunny day in open country. The foreground colours are a heavy green and a heavy red, which pass by rapid but fine gradations into the sun-bathed amber of the middle distance; this gradually sinks into aerial grey-purples, which brighten into the clear pallor of the sky.'<sup>1</sup>

Once, in the scene of the Stoning of Moses, the investigators were fortunate enough to discover an intact portion of the surface, which is

'invaluable as affording a basis for the mental reconstruction of other backgrounds of this cycle. For all incidents represented, together with such landscape details as were necessary to the story, were either silhouetted upon this lovely colour-scale, or woven into it. It should be observed that the yellow of the middle distance is more brilliant than the gold which replaces it in neighbouring pictures.'<sup>2</sup>

There are writers on art in whom language of this kind would arouse the suspicion that some exaggeration or even illusion underlay their descriptions; but Dr. Richter is too experienced a critic to mislead us in this way, and we may accept with confidence his account of the noble style and fine quality of the mosaics. But when we come to compare the facts with the conclusions which are drawn from them we are bound to confess that we are far from feeling the same confidence. As we have already pointed out, it is one thing to observe correctly, and another to establish the position that only one conclusion, excluding all others, can be drawn from those observations. We will endeavour to explain, so far as is possible without the aid of illustrations, what application of this distinction can be made in the case of the mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore and the theories of Dr. Richter.

Before we consider the evidence of the pictures themselves, a few words must be devoted to their architectural setting and the arguments which it suggests. We have no

<sup>1</sup> P. 48.

<sup>2</sup> P. 203 and pl. 24.

desire to give an undue importance to Dr. Richter's statements about the date of the structure of the basilica. While insisting that, in discussing the chronology of the mosaics, the question of the date of their conception must be kept apart from that of their execution,<sup>1</sup> he is well aware of the difficulties of supposing that they ever occupied any other than their present position, and the difference between the time of conception and execution is reduced to the suggestion (in the case of the pictures of the arch, which cannot, however, be separated in style from those of the nave) that they are 'second or third century copies of pre-existing, though almost contemporary, compositions.'<sup>2</sup> Dr. Richter's belief that the fabric of the basilica is of the end of the second century<sup>3</sup> is, therefore, of some importance for his argument. Let us see on what this surprising discovery, which has so long eluded even the veteran archæologists of Rome, reposes. In 1896 the late Mgr. Crostarosa published the results of an examination of the tiles of ancient origin which still partly cover the roof of the basilica. As is well known, the stamps with which Roman tiles were impressed are an indication of their date; and in the case of S. Maria Maggiore it was found that, out of the stamps of the first four centuries of the Christian era, more than half belonged to the second—a suggestive clue, according to Dr. Richter, to the date of the building.<sup>4</sup> But he has forgotten to tell us that Crostarosa's researches at the church of S. Martino ai Monti shewed an even larger proportion of second century tiles;<sup>5</sup> yet no one would suggest that that church belonged to the second century. The fact is that old tiles were freely used up like other old materials in the buildings of the fourth and later centuries, and if the tiles of the second century are the most numerous it is because the kilns were most productive in that period. Then we are told that the brickwork of the nave 'recalls the fine masonry of the time of Hadrian, but may be

<sup>1</sup> P. 43.<sup>2</sup> P. 44.1<sup>3</sup> P. 41.<sup>4</sup> *Nuovo Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana*, ii. (1896), 88. *Golden Age*, p. 26.<sup>5</sup> *N. Bull. Arch. Cr.* iii. (1897), 201. Apparently the roof of S. Croce shews similar results (*l.c.* p. 204).

some fifty years later.<sup>1</sup> There is a well-known test for dating Roman brickwork, and it is this: the thicker the layers of mortar between the bricks, the later the structure. If in the middle of the first century the mortar is sometimes almost invisible, by the end of the third it is generally thicker than the bricks.<sup>2</sup> There lie before us as we write photographs of the external brickwork of S. Maria Maggiore and also of that in the interior of the Arch of Constantine, and it is evident that, in this respect, there is little or no difference between them: the thickness of the mortar is equal to that of the bricks.<sup>3</sup> So that in this point, we fear, Dr. Richter's observation has been prejudiced by his desire to find evidence for an early date of the basilica. Once, again, when he tells us that

'the character of the building is chiefly due to the architrave which connects the columns, a peculiarity of early classic architecture which is absent from Constantinian churches, such as S. Paolo, S. Sabina, S. Pudenziana, S. Apollinare, and other churches of Rome, Ravenna, and elsewhere, in all of which the columns are bound together by arches,'<sup>4</sup>

he has omitted from the list two, not the least important, Roman basilicas, the old St. Peter's and S. Croce, which by themselves are enough to prove that the arcade had not universally replaced the architrave in the time of Constantine, while the choir of S. Lorenzo shews that the latter was not extinct even much later. As for the uniform series of ancient columns, it can be paralleled by that in the fifth century church of S. Sabina. With one more observation we will dismiss what may be called the architectural arguments. Mosaic, as a form of wall and ceiling decoration, is characteristic of the fourth and later centuries, and not of the second. We may not be able to trace every step by which mosaics passed from their earliest use as pavements, first to

<sup>1</sup> P. 27.

<sup>2</sup> Lanciani, *Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*, 46.

<sup>3</sup> We owe the comparison to Mr. T. Ashby, jun., the Assistant-Director of the British School at Rome.

<sup>4</sup> P. 42. 'Constantinian' is used here, apparently, in a very wide sense, for the churches mentioned are later than the time of Constantine

the walls and then to the vault, but there can be no doubt that if we have to settle on *prima facie* grounds the date of a system of wall-decoration in mosaic, like that of S. Maria Maggiore, we must look to the age of the Christian emperors, and not to that of the Antonines.

We have then reached this position, that we must find convincing evidence in the pictures themselves to make us believe that a characteristic fourth or fifth century form of decoration, attached to a fabric which, to say the least, is probably not older than the fourth century, belongs to the second or third. It is, after all, the style of the mosaics which forms the mainstay of Dr. Richter's theory. 'Classic in conception and composition,'<sup>1</sup> consisting 'of tightly-knit compositions, complete in themselves, both in action and interest, and of figures which are not conceived frontally but stand firmly, and move freely,'<sup>2</sup> they must be classed, we are told, with the sculptures of the Column of Marcus Aurelius and the Arch of Septimius Severus. Nearly a century ago that remarkable pioneer in the history of art, Seroux d'Agincourt, had drawn attention to analogies between these mosaics and the sculptures of the Column of Trajan.<sup>3</sup> But granted that they do possess all those 'classical' qualities which Dr. Richter can see in them, still the mere general impression of 'classicalism,' especially when found in the 'art forms of a classic civilisation no longer at its zenith,'<sup>4</sup> would not suffice to convince us. The art of the Constantinian and post-Constantinian ages was by no means uniform in its decadence. Survivals of 'classicalism' meet us in the times of incipient or even developed 'Byzantinism.' If, on the one hand, we have the barbaric contemporary reliefs of the Arch of Constantine, on the other the archangel on the leaf of an ivory diptych in the British Museum reminds us that the traditions of classical pose and drapery were not extinct perhaps a century later. Professor Wickhoff has called attention to the

<sup>1</sup> P. 47.

<sup>2</sup> P. 17, referring to Riegl's canons for distinguishing the art of the Decadence from that of the Early Empire.

<sup>3</sup> *Histoire de l'Art par les Monumens*, pt. ii. pl. xiv. and xv.

<sup>4</sup> P. 395.



fragments of 'classical' wall-painting from the Baths of Constantine preserved in the Rospigliosi Palace.<sup>1</sup> And when, some five years ago, the Byzantine Church of S. Maria Antiqua was unearthed in the Roman Forum, we were confronted by survivals of the classical tradition in painting which cannot be earlier than the sixth century. There too, as in S. Maria Maggiore, may be seen angel heads, the prototypes of which 'must be sought for in Pompeii'; and there too the technique of impressionist painting may be seen still in practice.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, with all respect for Dr. Richter's opinion, we cannot altogether feel that these pictures have that character of second-century 'classicism' which he claims for them. Take, perhaps, the closest of the analogies with the reliefs of the Column of Marcus Aurelius, the battle scene in which Joshua is depicted routing the Amorites,<sup>3</sup> and what does it prove beyond the fact that battle compositions of this kind naturally take the form of an 'equestrian central figure on either side of which fellow combatants are symmetrically grouped'?<sup>4</sup> The military costume is indeed classical, but the same may be said of that in the fifth century Joshua Roll in the Vatican Library, of which, we may remember in this connexion, Professor Wickhoff has said that 'among all the works of painting none comes nearer to the reliefs of the Column of Trajan.'<sup>5</sup> The scene of 'the separation of Lot from Abraham' in S. Maria Maggiore, with the 'dignified and disciplined motion with which the two patriarchal family groups move asunder,' recalls to Dr. Richter 'the rhythmic music of strophe and antistrophe in a Greek chorus.'<sup>6</sup> But from another point of view it also recalls in its treatment of a crowd of persons the common Byzantine feature by which only the crowns of the heads of those behind the front row appear in a receding perspective, so that the group takes more or less the form of a pyramid.

<sup>1</sup> *Roman Art*, p. 160 and pl. xiii.

<sup>2</sup> Papers of the British School at Rome, vol. i. We refer specially to the fragments of angel heads to the right of the apse, and to the picture of the Maccabees in the nave.

<sup>3</sup> Pl. 29, 1 and 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Roman Art*, p. 184.

<sup>4</sup> P. 249 and pl. 29, 1 and 2.

<sup>6</sup> P. 81 and pl. 8.

The same thing may be seen in the group of mothers in the 'Martyrdom of the Innocents' on the left of the arch,<sup>1</sup> though Dr. Richter thinks that it shews a modification of an original design, the figures being pressed together in order to fit them into the gradually diminishing space towards the bottom of the arch.<sup>2</sup> To us it appears to be incipient Byzantinism, just as the attitude of Simeon in the 'Presentation in the Temple,' bending forward as he advances with his outstretched hands veiled in his pallium, recalls numerous figures of saints and donors in Byzantine mosaics.<sup>3</sup>

Again, if Dr. Richter's theory be correct, we feel that it ought to be corroborated by the details of dress, fashion of the hair, and so forth. Yet we look in vain for anything characteristic of the special fashions of the Antonine age. On the other hand, when all allowance has been made for the changes produced by later restorations (as in the 'Marriage of Moses and Zipporah' <sup>4</sup>), the appearance of the figures generally is quite consistent with the representations of the fourth and later centuries. To mention one detail: the curious and still unexplained letters or marks on the ends of the pallium, which occur frequently throughout the mosaics,<sup>5</sup> is a feature which may have its origin in classical times, but is specially familiar to us from the pictorial art of the Christian Empire. To notice one more point, the half-length figure of Christ, appearing in the clouds above the meeting of Abraham and Melchizedek, is an example of that bearded and long-haired type which ultimately became the recognized form of representing the Saviour.<sup>6</sup> Dr. Richter, by a valuable suggestion which may throw light on its origin, compares it with the head of the philosopher in the scene on the arch, which he interprets as 'Philosophy a guide to Christ.'<sup>7</sup> Now it is well known that the earliest type of Christ is that of a beardless youthful figure, that the bearded type makes its appearance in the fourth century, and, after disputing the field with the earlier conception, at last won universal acceptance. The earliest dated example that we possess of the bearded type is

<sup>1</sup> Pl. 31.<sup>2</sup> P. 44; *cf.* 397.<sup>3</sup> Pl. 35, and *cf.* pl. 26, 1.<sup>4</sup> Pl. 15.<sup>5</sup> *E.g.* pl. 8.<sup>6</sup> Pl. 6. <sup>7</sup> Pl. 44, 2; *cf.* p. 64.

on the bowl acquired a few years ago by the British Museum, and shewn by the portraits of Constantine and his wife, Fausta, which accompany it, to be not earlier than the year 307, nor later than 327. If it could be convincingly proved on other grounds that the mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore belonged to the third century, then this head would be of high importance as a proof of the earlier date of the bearded type. But while there is so much to make us withhold our assent to that proposition, it must be carried to the other side of the account as an additional piece of evidence that the mosaics are not older than the time of Constantine.

It is time to ask to what conclusion all this is leading us. On the other hand, we have to take into account Dr. Richter's demonstration of the high artistic quality of the parts of the mosaics which are original, as distinguished from Byzantine and later interpolations—a demonstration which compels us, in view of the general decadence, to give them as early a date as possible, and is certainly difficult to reconcile with our ideas of fifth-century art. On the other hand, we have seen that the systematic decoration of a building with mosaic pictures, and those pictures drawn from Christian themes, is no less difficult to reconcile with what we know of the age of the Antonines, even if we could suppose that they had survived the persecutions; and that at the same time their general appearance and details are consistent with, and sometimes even characteristic of, Christian art in the days when it had become public and recognized. But there is a third series of considerations which may help us to form an answer to the problem.

Exigencies of space compel us to do little more than allude to the elaborate and ingenious exposition of the subject-matter of the mosaics which forms such an important part of Dr. Richter's argument. We have already indicated its leading idea—viz., that the treatment is based upon the theological conceptions of the Christian writers of the second and third centuries, conceptions which were obsolete in the fourth and fifth. It is impossible not to be impressed with the series of parallels to the representations of the four Old Testament types in S. Maria Maggiore, drawn from the

writings of Justin Martyr,<sup>1</sup> which are here laid before us. His treatment, as Dr. Richter says, 'is not merely harmonious with the general tendency embodied, but coincides with the pictures in question in the treatment of detail.'<sup>2</sup> A single example of these coincidences must suffice. The scene of Jacob's arrival at the house of Laban shews the young shepherd approaching from the right, while on the left

'is a temple-like building, from which issues an old man, who stretches a questioning hand towards the young girl who approaches him eagerly. To his left is an elderly woman soberly clad, in purple dalmatica and palla (therefore a woman of rank) and matron's cap. She does not share the old man's joyful excitement, but turns towards him with an expression of pained apprehension.'

Partly owing to the condition of the picture, and partly from misapprehension of the subject, previous observers had confused these persons. Ciampini thought that the youthful figure was Jacob, while Garrucci explained the one beside Laban as Rachel's nurse. Dr. Richter shews that they can only be Rachel and Leah, and the clue to the 'personification of youth, and hope, and success, in designed contrast to this sombre embodiment of retrospection and resignation,' he finds in Justin Martyr's words to the Jew Trypho: 'Jacob serves Laban for one of the daughters; and being deceived in the obtaining of the younger, he again serves seven years. Now Leah is your People and Synagogue; but Rachel is our Church. And for these Christ even now serves.'<sup>3</sup> 'Rachel, that is the Church, moving at the head of the sheep, leads the way. . . . The keynote of the composition is joy, joy at the coming of the shepherd. Leah alone, the Synagogue, is filled with apprehension.' And so in the next picture, 'the contrast between these two figures is woven into the very structure of the composition,' and the theme is pursued through all the series until Jacob receives the reward of his labours, and by his marriage with Rachel typifies the union of Christ with His Church.<sup>4</sup>

It might be said that interpretations of this kind are

<sup>1</sup> Mostly from the *Dialogue with Trypho*. <sup>2</sup> P. 12.

<sup>3</sup> *Dialogue with Trypho*, p. 134. <sup>4</sup> *Golden Age*, pp. 105, 122.

easily read into pictures, and that such results are inconclusive of the question of date. But the evidence of the pictures of the 'Gospel of the Infancy' on the arch is independent and more convincing. Their object, Dr. Richter explains, is to set forth the Manifestation of the Logos to the World; and it is surprising, if we believe that they are subsequent to the Council of Ephesus and the proclamation of the title of 'Theotokos,' to find that the scene of the Nativity itself is not represented, and that, in the Adoration of the Magi, Mary, by an omission which is perhaps unique, is absent from the throne, which is occupied in solitary state by her infant Son. What a contrast to the vanished mosaic of Xystus III., where she was the direct object of the homage of the martyrs, and how difficult to reconcile with his dedication of the basilica to the special honour of the Virgin-Mother of God! Is it not more reasonable to assume that the whole series belongs to an earlier age, when these aspects of the Incarnation had not yet acquired the prominence given to them in the fifth century?

We believe that there is a compromise by which these seeming contradictions and difficulties may be reconciled and explained. If we have been unable to assent to a proposal which would assign the mosaics to the age of the persecutions, on the other hand we confess that both from their style and subject-matter it is not easy to bring them into agreement with what we know of the pictorial art of the fifth century. If we were reduced to a dilemma, we might prefer to accept the latter date as, taking everything into consideration, the less improbable of the two. But there is a period to which, in the absence of documentary information as to their origin, these mosaics might reasonably be assigned without doing violence to any of the facts connected with their style and contents which Dr. Richter has established. The victory of Constantine, with the peace it brought to the world, and the official recognition it obtained for the Christian Church, marked the beginning of an epoch in art as in other things. The Constantinian art, in some respects a Renaissance, in others a new departure, can hardly, in an age of fresh constructive activity, have been without importance; but time

has been unkind to its monuments, and it is no doubt inadequately represented by the sculpture (such as that of the Arch of Constantine) by which it is chiefly known to us. We may well believe that the mosaics, which then for the first time played an important part in the decoration of buildings, and may therefore be regarded as specially characteristic of the epoch, were of far higher quality. Those in the dome of S. Costanza, to judge by the drawings made before their destruction, shewed that the tradition of classic design, as well as fertility of individual invention, were alike vigorous in the full tide of the Constantinian Renaissance.<sup>1</sup> And if we turn to almost the only surviving example of this art, the splendid rolling masses of vine foliage which still adorn one of the apses in the vestibule of the Lateran Baptistery, so satisfactory alike in construction and colour, we feel that we are looking on the counterpart for that age of the magnificent decorative sculpture of the first and second centuries. No doubt the decadence had set in, and nothing could arrest its fatal progress ; but even so the mosaic of the apse of S. Pudenziana is an evidence that the impulse given in the reign of the first Christian emperor had by no means exhausted its effects at the end of the century.

It is then to the Constantinian age that, on artistic grounds, we would suggest the ascription of the mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore. Nor do we think that there is anything in their contents and treatment which is inconsistent with that date. It is a far cry from the victory of Constantine to the age of Augustine and Jerome, and the definitions of the Council of Ephesus, and there is ample time in the earlier and middle decades of the fourth century for the execution of a series of pictures like those of S. Maria Maggiore, embodying the conceptions of an older epoch, not yet obsolete in the Christian world, and perhaps least of all in Rome itself. Or, to take another point on which Dr. Richter has laid stress—the apocryphal source of some of the subjects represented—we may remember that the first condemnation of the apocryphal writings did not take place till 382, nor

<sup>1</sup> They have been frequently reproduced : recently in W. Lowrie's *Christian Art and Archaeology*, fig. 126, p. 300.

their final one till a century later, even the earlier date being well outside the Constantinian age, and subsequent to the episcopate of Liberius, the traditional founder of the basilica.

To sum up: when we take into account the existence of a series of pictures in mosaic, the characteristic form of decoration of the fourth and later centuries; with artistic qualities both of design and technique which are classical, yet combined with details which no less markedly belong to the times of the Christian empire; with its subjects inspired by ideas current in the Christian world before the age of the Councils, or at least before the Council of Ephesus; we contend that no date explains this combination better than one in the epoch of Constantine and his immediate successors. Nor is it without interest to observe how nearly this agrees with the Roman tradition as to the origin of the church. The beginning of the episcopate of Liberius is separated by only fifteen years from the death of Constantine; and even if, as may well be the case, he adapted a somewhat older building, its Christian decoration by him would thus be in substantial agreement with the internal evidence of the mosaics as we understand it. We do not underrate the difficulties, arising from his precarious position, which Dr. Richter has urged against the authorship of Liberius<sup>1</sup>; but, on the other hand, the title of the 'Basilica Liberiana' cannot have been given to the church without some good reason. However, without being too precise, we would only ask in conclusion whether a date in the middle of the fourth century is not a more reasonable solution of the problem than that offered by Dr. Richter? These are difficult questions, and time alone can judge which answer is the right one. In any case we must feel grateful to the authors for a volume of such rich and varied interest, every page of which has its points of suggestion and instruction.

<sup>1</sup> P. 39.



## ART. V.—THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

## III. ITS RELATION TO THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION.

*For List of Books see Article I. (April 1905.)*

IN our two previous articles we have considered the external evidence for the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel, and some of the characteristics of the book itself. We must now consider the very important question whether there are in this Gospel such manifest impossibilities or anachronisms as to make the traditional view of its authorship untenable. This will lead on to the most difficult of all our problems, its relation to the Synoptic tradition.

It is unnecessary, we think, to consider the question of the miraculous element in this connexion. There is nothing in the miracles related in the Fourth Gospel such as to differentiate them fundamentally from those described in the others. And the question of the miraculous in general lies quite outside such a discussion as this. If it be maintained that miracles are impossible, and that a truthful man could not, therefore, have claimed to witness them, the whole discussion is at an end. But to introduce this question is to bring in considerations from metaphysics which arise, and must be dealt with, independently altogether of critical problems.

It is, however, maintained that it is impossible that anyone could have remembered the Discourses, as they stand; that here, therefore, we must allow considerable room for the exercise of imagination. And it is maintained that the doctrine of the Logos implies Alexandrine influence, and that other doctrines betray a sub-apostolic date. We will consider these points briefly.

First, with regard to the Discourses. We cannot but feel that anyone reading the Gospel for the first time would be impressed with the proportion borne by these Discourses to the rest of the book. They are of the most profound interest in themselves, and the history, though we maintain that it is intertwined with them by innumerable links, supplied the occasions for the Lord's self-manifestation in words. Thus the

impression is strong that the Gospel consists largely of long and closely-reasoned speeches, thereby differing markedly from the Synoptic Gospels. But an impression like this should not be allowed to pass without examination. Dr. Drummond has given us a very instructive and important note on the speeches.<sup>1</sup> In this note he expresses his belief that 'exaggerated statements have sometimes been made about their prolixity and dialectical style.' By comparing the words of our Lord in St. Matthew's Gospel he finds that the relative number and length of the speeches is as follows :

|                                    |             |       |          |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------|----------|
| Not exceeding 3 verses . . .       | Matth. 111. | . . . | John 96. |
| Exceeding 3 and not exceeding 10 . | Matth. 16.  | . . . | John 20. |
| Exceeding 10 " " " 20 .            | Matth. 8.   | . . . | John 3.  |
| Exceeding 20 . . .                 | Matth. 4.   | . . . | John 3.  |

This, it must be admitted, is an unexpected result. Further, with a view of testing the style of the speeches in the Fourth Gospel, whether they are 'rhetorical and flowing,' so that it would be 'impossible to pick out of them short and pregnant sayings,' he has selected sixty Sayings 'which easily stand by themselves, and imprint themselves on the memory.' The Sayings thus collected include such as the following (we quote in Dr. Drummond's translation, 'Unless a man be born from above, he cannot see the Kingdom of God'; 'I am the light of the world,' &c. And he adds with truth that 'one might add largely to the number.' This point, simple enough in itself, is of real importance in estimating their historical character. We should wish to add another consideration which seems to us of some value. In speaking of the Discourses, it seems to us usually to be assumed that they are the expansion by the Evangelist of very fragmentary reminiscences. Without denying that the mind of the author may have had some influence, possibly considerable influence, in determining their form, we venture to suggest that this is more likely to have been in the direction of abridgment rather than expansion. A very simple observation will confirm this probability. When we think of it, the longest of all the Discourses are really very short. In his

<sup>1</sup> *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 16-20.

table above mentioned, Dr. Drummond cites three speeches from this Gospel, one containing 26 verses, one 29, and one 52. In St. Matthew there are two, longer than any of these, one containing 93 and the other 107 verses. Thus the longest speech recorded in the Fourth Gospel contains 52 verses—about the length of two ordinary Lessons in church. That is, the longest of all the continuous speeches would take at most ten minutes to deliver; the main part of the discourse in chap. vi. (vv. 32–65, assuming that it belongs to one scene), would take from five to six minutes; the discourse with Nicodemus about two minutes or less. It is inconceivable that we can have in these close and fragmentary discourses all that really happened. The author must have given us only an abridged version of the actual discourse, and not an expansion of it. Moreover, this view of the facts will account for a feature in the Discourses, and still more in the dialogues, which Bishop Westcott notes in his Commentary. The connexion between one verse and another, between the question and the answer, is usually a hidden one: there are gaps needing to be filled, if the thought is to be seen in continuous movement. The hidden links are not as a rule obscure, but they are hidden, and it needs some little reflexion to bring them to light. It may be said with truth that considerations of this kind are of only subsidiary importance. They certainly will not prove that a disciple could have held so much of his Lord's words in his memory. But they do modify somewhat the psychological difficulty, and, at any rate, secure that the real problem is before us, and not one based on an unverified impression. And their strength is certainly not diminished if it be true, as is asserted by Dr. Abbott,<sup>1</sup> that the contemporary method of securing the memory of the teaching of a Master was by condensed summary. It is also a point worth noticing that under all the uniformity of style which marks the whole book, there is a difference of vocabulary between the Discourses and the parts due to the Evangelist. Wendt has called attention to one variety of usage—the words *ἐργα*

<sup>1</sup> Abbott and Rushbrooke, *Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels*, Introd., p. xi.

and *σημεῖα*<sup>1</sup>—and there are others. These points, as we have said, do not prove that we have an exact verbal report of our Lord's discourses: indeed, if the Evangelist has abridged them, it is necessarily something else than a verbal report that he has given us. But we may fairly trust to the report we have, unless other considerations should forbid it, as reproducing with accuracy and insight what our Lord actually said.

It has been maintained that the doctrine in this Gospel is strongly tinged with Hellenism, and that in some points it is later in character than is consistent with the ostensible date of the book. We must now pass on to consider this point. The first subject which necessarily comes up for discussion in this connexion is the doctrine of the Logos. This name is applied to our Lord only in the Johannine writings, and in the Gospel occurs only in the Prologue. There is no doubt that it was a phrase of the most vital importance to the Church when the time came for establishing relations with Gentile philosophy. Whatever history lay behind its use in the Fourth Gospel, it supplied at once a point of contact between Christian and Hellenic thought, and must have made the prospect of an alliance brighter and more hopeful. It must be clearly understood that the problem of the immediate source of the title in the Fourth Gospel and that of its subsequent use in the Church are different, and the fact that the doctrine of the Word was used as a mediating concept between Christianity and Hellenism is no proof that it was primarily an Hellenic idea. The question of the source of the phrase in the Gospel is far from being a simple one, and we cannot do more than indicate our reasons for holding one view rather than the other. If we read the Prologue by itself, leaving aside for a moment all the associations of the word Logos with Platonism and Stoicism, there is nothing that takes us outside the limits of the Old Testament, except the assertions in the first and fourteenth verses. We there read that the Logos is eternal, divine, and yet not to be confounded with God; and that He became flesh and dwelt among men. These statements would no doubt

<sup>1</sup> See Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, Art. 'St. John's Gospel,' ii. 719a.

have been impossible to an Old Testament writer. But the account of the operations of the Word in the creation of the world and the revelation of the Godhead to men, especially to the chosen people, are organically continuous with the language of the Old Testament. We see a development of Old Testament ideas, but there is no real breach in the continuity, no extraneous and incompatible idea. The first verse and the fourteenth imply a change, but still in the direction of intensification rather than fundamental variety of meaning. The Word of the Lord 'by whom the heavens were made' is seen to be a Divine co-equal Person—not a semi-personal attribute; the Word who revealed God to men, and was in the world and had His own home there, is declared to have become flesh in the fulness of grace and truth. The point of view is Biblical; there are no metaphysical questions consciously raised or answered.

On the other hand, the Logos-doctrine, as we find it among the Greek thinkers, is almost wholly a matter of metaphysics. In its earliest usage in Greek, the word Logos had associations which might easily have developed in the direction of such a doctrine as this of the Fourth Gospel. It meant both the outward vocal expression of thought, and the rational movement of the mind. But in the course of its history it became more closely concerned with the meaning of the thought in the world of reality, than with any revelation that a word might convey as to the character of the thinker. It tended, therefore, to stand for the fundamental law or principle which makes the world what it is—which was necessarily universal and abstract and impersonal—rather than for the immediate self-expression of a creating and self-revealing will. The further, therefore, the development proceeded on these lines, the less chance there was of reaching such a conception as that of the Logos incarnate; and, indeed, it needs only an elementary acquaintance with the history of the Church in its conflict with heresy, to see how many unexpected difficulties arose in the process of fitting Church-doctrine to philosophical expressions such as Logos. There is, perhaps, a *prima facie* ground for anticipating that the coincident choice of a phrase like this, by the Evangelist and writers like Philo Judæus, would be explained by previous

contact. If there were no history of the idea of the Word of God within Hebrew lines, we should be bound to explain the facts by the theory of previous contact. But it is certain that these are the two lines upon which the history of the word developed, and that they involved many incompatible associations. What really requires explanation is the fact that two strains of thought so divergent in character should have met under the cover of one word. The case for Hellenic associations in regard to other characteristic phrases of this Gospel—Light, Life, Truth, the World, &c.—is even less persuasive.

The question whether the doctrines expressed in this Gospel are so late in character as to fall outside any possible connexion with Christ Himself is of importance to our estimate of the historical value of the book, and still more in connexion with what we have called the most difficult of all our problems—the relation of this book to the Synoptic Gospels. It is obvious that this question will touch especially the 'Last Discourses.' The others, if our contentions above are in any way tenable, will have arisen, with whatever aid of subjective reflection, out of definite historical conditions. The 'Last Discourses,' though they are deeply coloured with the thought of departure, deal on a fuller scale with the future, and are less definitely associated with the details of the scene. Moreover, their length is such as to make the suggestion of a free use of the imagination more plausible. We are not concerned to work out the connexion and coherence of the Discourses as a whole; we have only to consider the teaching contained in them, and especially the form given to it. We venture to maintain that the form and character of the teaching both point to a date before the experience of the Church had begun. And we think that this emerges from a comparison of the language of the Discourses with that of the First Epistle of St. John. It cannot, we think, be plausibly denied that the Gospel and the First Epistle are by the same hand<sup>1</sup>; it becomes a point of considerable importance,

<sup>1</sup> The identity of authorship, has, indeed, been denied, but the similarity of style is very marked: and it is impossible to maintain that the two authors, if there were two, were widely separated in environment. See Drummond's *Authorship*, Bk. ii., Sect. i., ch. 3.

therefore, if we can shew a marked difference in the language employed on kindred subjects in the two works. That there is a very close relation between the Epistle and the Discourses is unmistakably plain. The idea of abiding in Christ, and Christ in us, is a salient feature of both, and in regard to it we do not notice any very striking differences of treatment. But this is not the case with some of the other topics touched in the Discourses. The main subject of these speeches is, as we have said, our Lord's approaching departure. He refers to it again and again, but He consoles the Apostles in the prospect of it by promising to return. The mode of His return is in large measure left obscure, as is also the manner of His departure. It is a return which involves the mission of the Paraclete, and yet is so closely bound up with the activity of the Son and the Father, that our Lord is able to say (xiv. 23): 'If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him'; there is no clear demarcation between the functions of the Paraclete and the Son, except that the Spirit is sent 'in my name' by the Father (xiv. 26), or, as the phrase is elsewhere (xv. 26), 'Whom I will send you from the Father.' The world will not understand this new revelation (xiv. 17), but is rebuked or convicted by the Spirit (xvi. 8-11), Who, on the other hand, will lead the future Church into all the truth. The effect of the new order is that the disciples love one another, that they carry on the Lord's work, so that the Father is glorified in the Son, and that they enjoy the right of assured and unhindered access to God in prayer. In these chapters we have a sketch of a condition of things which, even if imperfectly apprehended, might work some sort of consolation in the minds of the Apostles about to lose their Master. He does not tell them whither He is going. He sets that question aside. But He promises a future in which communion with Himself will be more lasting, more complete, more effective, through the coming of the Spirit of Truth. The world will misunderstand and hate and persecute, but is already overcome. It has no power to



interrupt the union that is to be between the disciples and their Lord.

When we turn to the First Epistle, profoundly influenced as it is by these 'Last Discourses,' we find a very different state of things. Much that stands in vague outline in the Discourses is articulated through the experience of the Church in the Epistle. The ideal picture of a community of brethren in unbroken union with the Lord is crossed by the fact of sin; and the writer appeals without hesitation to the Blood of Jesus Christ as capable of cleansing wholly from it. In spite of the use of the word Paraclete for the Holy Spirit in the Gospel, he assures us that we have 'a Paraclete with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and He is the propitiation for our sins.' But there is no confusion here with the work of the Holy Spirit. The unction which the faithful have received teaches them of all things, and is true and no lie (ii. 27); enables them, therefore, to avoid those who would deceive them, and to try spirits whether they be of God (cf. iv. 1-6). The mission of the Spirit has already taken place, and they know some of the effects of it. Moreover, it is distinguished from the future return of Christ. In the Epistle we read of His coming (*παρουσία*, ii. 28), of the time when He shall be manifested (iii. 2), of the Day of Judgement (iv. 17). Prayer is still assured and certain in its power; but 'there is a sin unto death: I say not that he should pray for it' (v. 16). Already it has become necessary to insist on dogmatic truth, on the confession that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh (iv. 2, 3). The atmosphere has changed for reasons which are perfectly plain and real; and it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that in the Epistle we have the reflexion of the writer upon the conditions of his day, in the Gospel a trustworthy memory of the actual words of Christ. As before, we do not deny the presence of some subjective influence, probably, as we have said, taking the form of compression; but we think that the Discourses as they stand have all the marks of a true report of what actually occurred, and that they underlie and explain such a writing as the First Epistle.

The result of this somewhat extended discussion is, we maintain, that the internal evidence from the book considered

in itself confirms the inference suggested by the external evidence. There is nothing in the book itself which is inconsistent with the traditional view of the authorship. The author is clearly a person who had an intense consciousness of a fact, and was no less capable of estimating its significance. Such indications as there are of a tendency to allegorize are wholly disproportionate to the evidence of the strong historic sense of the author. Moreover, unless we are very gravely mistaken, he has succeeded in preserving the character of the period he professes to describe without being guilty of anachronisms—an achievement which few, if any, non-contemporary writers find possible. We have been unable to accept the reasoning by which it is maintained that the book is composite, and that the later author is drawing upon a fragmentary Johannine source; its unity and closeness of texture forbid this view. But though there is all this very powerful evidence, as it seems to us, in favour of the Johannine authorship, it remains that the book does present a view of Christ which differs in many remarkable respects from that in the Synoptic Gospels, and we must now consider the question whether this difficulty is insurmountable.

It cannot be denied that this question is one of extreme difficulty. Indeed, we do not think we are going too far when we say that the various theories of the origin and composition of the Fourth Gospel would not have had the smallest chance of being considered favourably, if it had not been that they seem easier than the theory of Christ's nature which the four Gospels put before us. The differences between the two traditions amount, in the view of many scholars, to contradictions; and the theories, some of which we have been considering, are successive attempts to account for and estimate historically the two traditions. Perhaps we may go a little further even than this, and say that not only is this problem one of the most difficult of all critical problems, it is also one of which no complete and unassailable solution can ever be found. If we accept the traditional view of the four Gospels, it remains that there are certain divergences between them, and especially between the Synoptists and the author of the Fourth Gospel, which it is impossible wholly to reconcile. If

we adopt one or other of the mediating theories, we may succeed, with the aid of hypothetical documents and redactions, in producing an apparently intelligible account of the origin of our four books ; but we soon find that these hypothetical constructions partake of the nature of the infinite ; there is hardly any limit to them ; their conjectural basis is a serious difficulty to them all ; and they are apt, while producing a settlement of the literary question, to fail disastrously in accounting for the effect of the life of Christ, and the origin of that assumed unhistorical idea of it which the Gospels as they stand reveal, and which has certainly been the motive force of Christianity at every period of which we know anything definite. In embarking, therefore, on this part of our subject we cannot hope to produce an answer to all possible questions that is beyond cavil ; the utmost we can expect to do is to state what we think is the view which has fewest inherent difficulties, and to give some reasons for our opinion.

It is fortunate that there is little disagreement about the nature of the divergence between the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel ; any careful reader could draw out a list of the obvious points of variation. It is important, however, for our discussion that the question should be stated carefully : we will therefore begin by setting down the heads of variation, and will then indicate which of them seem to us to need serious discussion. It is obvious on comparing the two accounts that the Synoptic version of our Lord's life has its scene laid mainly in Galilee, that it is apparently supposed to occupy only one year, and that the ministerial work consisted largely in acts of mercy performed upon the sick and in discourses to comparatively simple people, in which the method of parable was largely used. In the Fourth Gospel a large portion of the history is placed in Jerusalem ; three Passovers at least are named, and it is impossible to accept the Johannine chronology if the ministry lasted only one year ; instead of the simple folk with whom our Lord is dealing in the Synoptic story, He delivers profound and somewhat abstruse discourses to audiences which, clearly, are educated ones, and capable of sustaining a sharp discussion on the points

where they are at variance with the new Prophet. We venture to think that too much has been made of these differences. If any of the four Gospels professed to be a complete biography difficulty would necessarily arise. But none of them does profess this. They are all books of anecdotes, selected out of a much larger store of current knowledge and cast into their present form for some purpose, stated frankly, as in the case of St. Luke and St. John, or to be traced somewhat precariously by critics, as in the case of the other two Gospels. There is nothing in the Synoptic account which definitely excludes the possibility of a ministry longer than one year in duration, or of visits to Jerusalem previous to the Passover of the Passion. Indeed, as has often been pointed out, there are signs in the Synoptists themselves of a ministry outside that which they describe. We need only mention the attitude of the authorities at Jerusalem when our Lord arrives for the last Passover: such an attitude would be unintelligible if He had been such an entire stranger there as the Synoptic account alone would imply. Nor is the chronology a real difficulty. The chronology of all four Gospels is extremely loose, and it is impossible to construct an absolutely certain chronological scheme for the Life. The number of days within our Lord's ministerial Life of which we know anything are really very few, and the events, all told, are in most cases items in a region largely blank. A series of days is fixed in the Johannine account at the beginning of the Ministry, though without a definite date of departure; and there is in all four accounts a fairly full history of the last week. Otherwise time references are very vague. In the Fourth Gospel they are only marked precisely within the circle of one narrative: the separate scenes and events are connected in the loosest manner. Thus the writer marks the succession of time within the account of the Feeding of the Five Thousand and its sequel, but he gives no account of the interval between these events and the Feast of Tabernacles. He begins chap. vii. with the words *καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα*—a phrase which may cover several weeks at the least. Further, if it be granted that our Lord may have ministered both in Galilee and Jerusalem, it is clearly probable that He would

have used different methods with the different people, and that different topics would have arisen for discussion. Here also it is possible that the importance of the obvious differences may be greatly exaggerated.

A further noticeable difference is to be found in the selection of events to be recorded. Thus the Fourth Gospel omits the Baptism, the Temptation, the Transfiguration, the Institution of the Eucharist, and the Agony in the Garden. The Synoptists, on the other hand, are silent as to nearly all the miracles recorded by St. John, and conspicuously as to the raising of Lazarus. Some of these omissions are certainly very difficult to explain; but it is important here also to avoid exaggerating their significance. St. Mark's is the only Gospel in which there is not a large peculiar element; St. Matthew and St. Luke both have large sections in which they stand alone; and the distinctive feature of the Fourth Gospel consists not in having peculiar elements, but in shewing so little direct contact with the Synoptic tradition. In the other Gospels there seems to be a common ground, to which large additions were made in St. Matthew and St. Luke. In the Fourth Gospel the 'peculiar' element is very strong indeed, and there is very little use of the common Synoptic tradition. Moreover, we must remark that we are not in a position to offer any very definite explanation of the selection or omission of incidents. To answer the question why this incident was chosen and the other neglected we should have to know much more than we ever can know of the circumstances and ideas of the writers, their way of thinking and writing, and the position of certain subjects in the mind of the Church. For instance, if St. John wrote his Gospel according to tradition for the Church at Ephesus in the latter part of his life, it might well have seemed wholly unnecessary to describe over again the Institution of a Sacrament, constantly celebrated around him, and of which every Christian knew the story as well as he did. But we cannot say, because we do not know, that this is the reason why there is no account of the Institution. It seems to us, therefore—to adapt again Butler's phraseology—that we are likely to be imperfect judges beforehand of what was to be expected in a Gospel, and

it will be unsafe to rest too much weight on omissions in either account, though they may startle us.

These are all difficulties which arise because the two accounts are so largely independent, and we have lost all the links which would bridge over the gap between them. But the matter becomes more serious if we find fundamentally different conceptions of things in the two traditions. If it could be demonstrated, not merely that there are irreconcilable differences on this or that historical point, *e.g.* the date of the Crucifixion, but also irreconcilably divergent views of the character and aims of our Lord Himself, we should then be confronted with the necessity of deciding which of the two accounts we propose to trust. In such a case, one at least must go. It is contended by many critics that this is the case in regard to the Life of Christ.

The points which are selected for criticism in this sense are numerous, but the most important are the following. (1) It is maintained that the account of John the Baptist in chaps. i. and iii. of the Fourth Gospel is incompatible with the picture of him in the Synoptists. (2) It is maintained that there is a different conception of miracles and their significance in the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel. (3) It is contended that the whole character of our Lord's claims and teaching is different in the two accounts. We think there is something to be said in deprecation of this sweeping judgement on all the three points.

(1) The Gospels tell us very little at the best about John the Baptist. In the Synoptic Gospels (taking the three together) we have an account of his manifestation, a brief outline of some of his teaching, the story of the Baptism of our Lord, of his imprisonment, message, and death. Moreover, the public ministerial work of Christ in Galilee is dated at the time of John's imprisonment. In the Fourth Gospel he appears twice, as giving powerful witness to the Lord, and as rebuking (chap. iii.) those of his disciples who endeavoured to excite rivalry between the two prophets. This last scene clearly falls in the time of which the Synoptists say nothing—between the Baptism of our Lord and the imprisonment. But there is nothing in it



that contradicts the Synoptic tradition; the incident with Herod which led to the imprisonment shews that the Baptist was still at work after the Baptism of our Lord, and there is no intrinsic improbability in the story in St. John iii. Such contradiction as there is attaches to the scene in chap. i., where John the Baptist witnesses to Christ. All the Evangelists agree that John represented himself only as the forerunner of one greater than himself, who would baptize with the Holy Ghost; but the Synoptists leave it uncertain whether he recognized his greater follower in Jesus of Nazareth. The account in St. Matthew seems to imply that he realized that Jesus had no need of Baptism at his hands; but the story of the message from prison suggests that he was uncertain of His character even at that date. On the other hand, the writer of the Fourth Gospel makes the Baptist describe our Lord in the striking phrase 'the Lamb of God,' and definitely identify Him, on the strength of the sign given him by God, with the prophet who should baptize with the Holy Ghost. There is certainly here the appearance of direct conflict of evidence. But we think that it does not touch the representation of the Baptist so closely as the representation of our Lord. The Synoptic account does not exclude the possibility that John recognized the Lord, and the language in the Fourth Gospel (c. i. 26, 27, 32-4) has the Synoptic language behind it. The real point at issue is whether our Lord knew Himself and allowed Himself to be described in Messianic terms from the first. If we are able to shew reasonable probability that He did, the divergence with regard to the Baptist's teaching is not so wide as to be fatal.

(2) The question of the miracles also throws us back upon the character and claims of our Lord; but it has a certain importance of its own, as casting some light upon the principles and ideas of the Evangelist. It is alleged—by Wendt with great emphasis—that, whereas in the Synoptists the miracles are merely acts of benevolence, upon which Christ Himself lays no stress, but which are the natural result of faith of a particular kind, in the Fourth Gospel they are separated from the requirements of faith, appealed to as evidential, and have what is commonly called a thaumaturgic



character. It appears to us that, on this point, Wendt's reasoning is unpersuasive; his contention is based on a narrow and hard treatment of the text, such as we noticed before. It is true that the miracles described in the Synoptic Gospels are mostly miracles of healing, that our Lord refuses to perform mere works of power to meet the requirements of the Pharisees or priestly party, and again that he calls upon those concerned for faith—either the immediate subject of the miracle or (as in the case of Jairus' daughter) the persons connected with the subject to the miracle. It has to be noticed, however, that the faith required for the performance of a miracle varies greatly in its forms, but consists invariably in an attitude of reliance upon Christ, which may be displayed in word or in act: the acts displaying it being either voluntary on the part of the recipient of the miracle, or performed in obedience to Christ's command. Thus the centurion and the Syrophœnician woman shew their faith in what they say, in the kind of appeal they make to the Lord. The ten lepers shew theirs by doing without question what the Lord bids them: the woman with the issue of blood by touching the hem of Christ's garment. There is no essential difference between these and the nobleman's son in the Fourth Gospel, or the paralytic at the pool of Bethesda, or the man born blind. In the last two cases the writer describes very slightly the circumstances leading up to the miracle; the peculiarity of the story really consists in the teaching which followed. Of the other Johannine miracles two are common to the Synoptists and St. John (those in chap. vi.), while the miracle at Cana and the Miraculous Draught belong to the class in which the wider forces of nature are involved; and, though it would be possible to argue that they also require the obedient co-operation of the followers of Christ, yet they must naturally be expected to take a somewhat peculiar form. It is difficult to see how Wendt can treat the raising of Lazarus as a mere thaumaturgic act in view of the conversation with Martha xi. 21-27).

But it is contended that in the Fourth Gospel the motive of the miracles is different and also the importance attached to them. This, however, is only partly true. There is no precise

parallel in the Synoptic Gospels to the miracle at Cana, of which the motive is partly expressed and partly hidden in the colloquy with the Virgin Mother. The previous events which led to the Feeding of the Five Thousand are not described by the writer, but he adds a fact which explains the existence of large crowds in that region at all, viz. that the Passover was near (St. John vi. 4). It is not only in this Gospel that the sabbatical question is raised, apparently of set purpose, by a miraculous act. The healing of the dropsical man (St. Luke xiv.) is a case in point. We do not read in the Fourth Gospel of the difficulty our Lord had in drawing away from the crowds, but then we read very little of His work in Galilee. He certainly works a miracle occasionally as a sign, even in the Synoptic account, as in the case of the paralytic at Capernaum (St. Mark ii. 1-12), and though the Evangelist himself speaks of the rejection of Christ's signs (xii. 37) and their importance in producing a definite faith in Him (xx. 31), yet he makes our Lord (as Wendt himself points out) speak more broadly of His works (xv. 24); and, after all, the witness of the works or the signs is only one strand in a complicated web of witness which the Evangelist recognizes throughout. Even in the Synoptists the cities in which His mighty works were done are rebuked for their failure to interpret them rightly (St. Matthew xi. 20).

(3) We come, therefore, to consider the most important of all our points: the question of the character and claims of our Lord Himself. The difficulty raised by critics affects the whole presentation of Christ. It is contended that in the Synoptic account we have a prophet, sensible of a mission from God, recognizing Himself after the Baptism but not recognized by others from the first as the Messiah; there is, it is said, a development traceable in the conception of Him and His work, which is almost wholly absent in the Fourth Gospel. In this book, it is maintained, the prophet declares Himself from the first as the Divine Christ, and His speech and action are governed by this idea. Hence we have the long discussions, so characteristic of the Gospel, on the nature and prerogatives of the Son. The former seems a natural and intelligible process; the latter is too profoundly affected by

theological considerations to be historical. It is admitted that the writer of the Fourth Gospel was aware of the Synoptic tradition—that he used it, and possibly intended to supplement and correct it; but it is maintained that he dealt very freely with it in the interests of his later theological reflexion on the nature of the Lord. This position is worked out differently by different writers, but in general outline is as stated. It is assumed that the Synoptic account, or at least its earlier constituents, give the historical account of our Lord—so far as any account is historical—and that the secondary elements in the Synoptists, and the Fourth Gospel, represent the earlier stages of theological and philosophical reflexion.

In order to weigh this view, let us turn to the Synoptic Gospels and consider what are the characteristic marks of the narrative. We cannot fail to observe, in the first place, one very important feature of them all. Their main interest seems to be to describe Christ as He appeared—to give an account of His manifestation. We have, therefore, the irreducible minimum of comment upon Him, and upon His actions. The Evangelists notice in a sentence here and there the effect of His teaching on the crowd—it was ἐν ἑξουσίᾳ—the hostility of the Pharisees and its causes, the general and superficial result of His miracles. But there are very few places indeed where they tell us anything more precise as to the opinion entertained of Him. Herod, we read, supposed that He was John the Baptist risen again. Peter, in answer to our Lord, says that some thought He was John the Baptist, others Elijah, others Jeremiah or one of the prophets. There is no doubt that at the time of the Triumphal Entry the people who followed our Lord into Jerusalem had made up their minds, for the time, that He was the Messiah. It is not, however, easy to learn from the Synoptists by what processes or through what intermediate stages they had attained this result. Nor is it easy, if we confine ourselves to the Synoptic tradition, to explain the mental development of the Apostles themselves. They are called quite suddenly, without, so far as this narrative tells us, any previous preparation; they follow the Lord and see His miracles and hear His words. Shortly

after the Feeding of the Five Thousand He challenges them to say what they think of Him, and Peter makes his great confession. From this time forward we may assume that they all held that He was the Messiah; but it is difficult to maintain, on the Synoptic basis, that we can trace the process by which they arrived at this view, or explain the hold He had upon them from the first. We can *imagine*, especially with occasional help from the Fourth Gospel, an evolutionary process by which their convictions developed and crystallized; but it is not put clearly before us in the Synoptists. They, as we have noted, are mainly concerned to record what Christ did and said, and it is probable that they relied on the general knowledge of their readers to put the proper interpretation upon the record.

When we ask what position Christ seems to claim in the Synoptic narrative, the obvious answer is the position of a teacher and prophet, who taught of a kingdom of God, and used His power for the relief of pain and sorrow. The loftier claims of Christ are not, perhaps, on the surface of the Synoptic narrative; but they are at no great distance below it.

This fact needs little argument to establish it in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. Unless the first two chapters are treated as entirely unhistorical, it is clear that there was from the beginning a sense that Jesus was not the same as any ordinary prophet, but came with special powers and a comprehensive mission. The scene in the Temple (Luke ii.) is consistent with the description of the Birth and its circumstances. Moreover, there are scenes in both these Gospels which are quite inconsistent with the theory that the fuller conception of Jesus as more than an ordinary prophet was the product of the later stages of His ministry only. Thus, at His first appearance in the synagogue at Nazareth, He claims that the prophecy of Isaiah (lxi. 1 sqq.) is fulfilled in Himself. He affirms that all things have been delivered unto Him by the Father, and that through Him alone is knowledge of the Father possible. (Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 21-24. The style of these passages closely approaches that of the Johannine discourses.) But it may possibly be argued that these passages do not represent the

earliest form of the Synoptic tradition. We must, therefore, turn to St. Mark, who is generally admitted to have preserved this form the most completely, and ask what is the impression of Christ which is to be derived from his Gospel. It would be disproportionate to work out the answer to this question in any great detail, but the following points are, we think, decisively important in regard to it. (a) St. Mark tells us nothing of the early history of our Lord, but the testimony to His position at the Baptism is as clear as in any of the accounts. (b) St. Mark usually gives us only a clear and circumstantial account of facts which he affirms to have occurred. He offers no comment, unless some challenge of our Lord's position arises out of the fact described. Thus many of the miraculous acts are simply set down without exposition, but in the case of the paralytic at Capernaum (chap. ii. 3-11) the words used by our Lord provoke criticism and lead Him to claim, as Son of Man, power on earth to forgive sins. In like manner it is a challenge of His proceedings in regard to the Sabbath which leads Him to claim to be Lord over the Sabbath (ii. 28). (c) He is represented as exercising miraculous powers of the highest kind, and the liberation of these is directly connected with faith in Himself. He refuses the testimony of the possessed, who declare His character apart from the spiritual condition necessary to approach the understanding of it: but at the same time He attempts to concentrate attention upon Himself or His own work. He comes with a mission, but He speaks and acts as one having authority, and His answer to the question of the High Priest (xiv. 61, 62) is only consistent with the whole course of His action and speech.

In all these, and like cases, we have indications of claims greatly beyond those of any prophet, involving prerogatives which are strictly Divine. But they are all put forward incidentally; they do not form the basis for any extended teaching; they are not, however, incidental in themselves. Some of them come early in the history, others late: as occasion requires, claims which were always present come into notice and are mentioned. And it is true also of these narratives that Christ is the central figure, and not, strictly speaking, any

one title or view of Him. This, as it seems to us, is a point which must be remembered if we are to look at the questions arising out of the history in their true proportion. Christ is anxious to win followers, who will trust Him altogether. His miracles, as we have seen, demand complete self-surrender to His power, but He seems to ask this submission for Himself, for His own sake, as it were, and not as Messiah. He *is* Messiah, though He will not allow the possessed to say so, but there is more than this, and the current conception of what that title means is infinitely less than what He claims to be. He presents Himself to the world of His day for acceptance or rejection; and Bethsaida and Chorazin are condemned because they have missed the teaching of His mighty works, — Jerusalem, because it kills the prophets, and stones those who are sent unto it, and is too blind to know the time of its visitation. Once more, we notice in the Synoptic narrative a peculiar method, on the part of our Lord, of dealing with individuals. He does not teach so much as help them to learn. He takes them as they are, and tries to lead them a step or two further on. We see this in the Synoptists, chiefly in the ethical region. People who offer service up to a point are tested by further demands<sup>1</sup>: new duties are pointed out, and an opportunity is given for a wider view of things. The plan of teaching by parables is itself an illustration of this: parables encourage reflexion and inquiry, and for those who use them rightly are a means of providing knowledge that is living and personal. We do not think that in these remarks we have gone beyond what is fairly obvious in the Synoptic narrative. The words and acts described of Him point us away from themselves to Him.

These indications are sufficient to shew that, under whatever remarkable divergence of form, the claims which our Lord makes upon His contemporaries are not conceived in any fundamentally different way in the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel. In both alike He claims unique relations with the Father; in both He claims to exercise Divine prerogatives, such as forgiveness of sins, and judgement; in both He claims absolute self-surrender from His followers,

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.* the rich young man (Mark x. 17-22).



and to have the sole right and title to reveal the Father. In the Fourth Gospel, it is true, these points occupy a much larger space than in the Synoptists. They, as we have seen, are chiefly concerned with a bare narrative of deeds and words, mainly in Galilæan environment. The fourth Evangelist also describes certain acts, with considerable minuteness of detail; but he passes on quickly to the effect produced by them on people of a very different class from the Galilæan crowds. And this is a point of no slight importance, though it must not be pressed further than it will go. If we look at the various discourses in their setting, without weighting ourselves with any hypotheses of composite origin for the book, it will be found that they arise naturally out of their situations. Our Lord leads some inquirer gradually to a clearer knowledge of Himself (as in chaps. iv. and ix., x.); or He develops under questioning the fuller meaning of His own words and acts (as in chaps. v. and vi.); or He develops the significance of some Jewish rite (as in chap. vii. 21 sqq.); or, as in the Last Discourses, He expounds to His followers the meaning of His departure. It is impossible to say that the situations themselves are unnatural or incredible; they would seem to be the most obvious situations in which we should expect to find a prophet with a mission like that of our Lord. Nor is it easy to conceive how our Lord could have dealt with them within the lines of the public teaching by parables which we find in the Synoptic Gospels. When He uses parables in controversy or in private dealing with men, they are always employed to point some moral or spiritual lesson. The discourses in the Fourth Gospel would have been, in most cases, irrelevant to the situations described by the Synoptists, just as it is hard to see how the method illustrated by them should have been applied to the questions in St. John. The two types of situation are in no sense incompatible. There is nothing in itself remarkable in the fact that our Lord was asked by one person 'Who is my neighbour?' and by another 'How does He now say, I have come down from heaven?' But it would have been very remarkable indeed if He had returned the same kind of answer to both. And if it be



said that the style and language in the two traditions is strikingly different, that must be admitted. But it will be partly accounted for by the fact to which we have already called attention, namely that the discourses as they stand in the Fourth Gospel are almost certainly abridgements of the words actually spoken. And it must be remembered also that those passages (*e.g.* Matt. xi. 27, Luke xiii. 32, 33) in which the meaning comes nearest to the theological passages in the Fourth Gospel, also approach it very closely in style. While, therefore, we cannot deny that there is a gap, as it were, between the two accounts which we cannot securely bridge over, we do not admit that it amounts to incompatibility or contradiction, so far as style and subject-matter go.

The discussion on the position claimed by our Lord has incidentally shewn the direction in which we should be disposed to deal with the contention that the doctrine in the two traditions differs to the point of contradiction as to our Lord's nature. We think, as we have said, that this view ignores all but the superficial characters of the two narratives, and therefore greatly exaggerates their differences. We need not delay over the other doctrinal matters upon which there is said to be irreconcilable divergence. Perhaps the strongest instance is the doctrine of Judgement. Here there is certainly very wide difference in expression. On the one hand we have the eschatological discourses about the fall of Jerusalem and the Last Day, on the other a view of judgement as a continuous unceasing process carried on all through men's lives. But we must point out that, in the first place, there is no radical incompatibility between the thought of a gradual process of judgement or self-declaration, and that of a catastrophic climax in which tendencies that have long been determining themselves are fully declared. In a mountainous country, there is no incompatibility between the avalanche when it comes, and the countless processes of percolation and loosening which have been in operation for ages to lead up to it: the catastrophic climax is the natural outcome and effect of them. And we may remark further that the author of the First Epistle saw no incompatibility: as we

have already seen, he speaks both of the *παρουσία* and Judgement.

In regard to the whole question of doctrine, one point of considerable importance should be mentioned. If the Synoptic tradition be taken alone as a complete picture of our Lord's Teaching, it is extremely hard to see how the Church so soon arrived at the dogmatic position even of the Acts of the Apostles. We have urged that the Synoptic account contains more doctrinal implications than appear at first sight. But, taken at its highest, it seems to leave a considerable lacuna unfilled between itself and the very earliest days of the post-Pentecostal Church. Moreover, the doctrine of God was not developed in one part of the Church only : it underlies, for instance, the characteristic differences of expression of St. Paul and St. Peter ; and this fact becomes intelligible, if we may accept the Johannine tradition as historical.

On the whole, we are of opinion that the simplest and most natural solution of the many problems raised by the Fourth Gospel is the traditional belief that it was written by St. John, the beloved Apostle of our Lord, and contains trustworthy history. We think that the external evidence for this view is extremely strong, much stronger than the evidence usually is for the traditional ascription of an ancient book. Further, we think that the book itself bears out the inferences from external evidence : we do not find in it the anachronisms and blunders which are the almost inevitable fate of writers who use imagination to create fictitious history ; still less do we find in it the absurdities and crude impossibilities which were characteristic of religious fiction in the early days of the Church. And lastly, while we do not deny that there are serious difficulties in explaining the relation of this Gospel to the Synoptists, we think that these difficulties have been exaggerated, and are not fatal. It is probable that no final solution will ever be attained of the divergence as to the day and hour of the Crucifixion, and that there will always remain a difference in the impression of our Lord derived from the two accounts. We do not think, however, that these difficulties are sufficient to overbalance the very strong weight of evidence on the other side, and it has to be remembered

also that, with the exception of the Baptist, the characters which appear in the two narratives correspond in the most remarkable manner.

We have not attempted to cover the whole ground of the criticism of the Fourth Gospel. To have done so would have meant writing a book of very considerable size. Nor have we attempted to follow the various theories of the origin and character of the Gospel into all their various forms. This also would have required more space than we can command, and would have tended, also, to obscure the points which we wish to bring forward. Roughly speaking, there are three theories possible as to the Gospel. We may hold that St. John wrote it, or we may hold that it was put together by a later disciple out of documents partly traceable to St. John, or we may hold that it is in one way or another a work of the imagination. Either of the last two views may be expressed in a variety of forms. It is unlikely that scholars will be unanimous as to the number and the delimitation of the component documents. And, of course, if it be held that the book is a fiction, different accounts of its origin will be supplied according to the different motives alleged for its composition and the various methods supposed to have been used. The real Johannine question is not primarily, Which of all these various forms of theory is most plausible? but, Did the Apostle John write the book or not? We have endeavoured to shew cause for thinking that he did, and we are, therefore, exonerated from going into the detailed variety of opposing theories.

We have said that the traditional belief as to the book seems to us still the simplest and most natural account of it. This is an additional reason for contrasting it with its typical opponents. In the question of this and of many other books there is a problem of scientific method involved as well as a problem of history. In a sense it is a truism to say that the simplest theory of the authorship of a book is that the man wrote it whose name is on the title-page. This is not the sense in which we claim that our view is the simplest. We claim for it that it is the simplest because it does, as we think, account fairly for all the phenomena, and does not

require either the aid of hypothetical documents or any other machinery to explain the existence of the Gospel. This is where we hold that there is a lamentable theoretical unsoundness in some of the opposing views. The analysis of a book into pre-existing documents is a very precarious process, and requires strong evidence to support it. We can illustrate our point best by an instance. The composite origin of the Synoptic Gospels is easy to believe, because very nearly the whole of St. Mark is imbedded in St. Matthew and can be disengaged with very little trouble. The documents composing the Pentateuch are traceable with very considerable certainty, and it is quite easy to analyze out the parts of the Books of Kings which are in the Chronicles. In all these cases there are strong tangible grounds for the theory of composite origin. But we think that there is practically no evidence for the composite origin of the Fourth Gospel; the points regarded as proving it are indecisive and often extremely minute; and there is not the slightest evidence of the existence of the component documents *in rerum natura*. What is true of hypothetical documents is true also of hypothetical authors. All theories of composite authorship require the assumption of unknown and conjectural authors. These we need not discuss separately, as the authors are merely a personification of hypothetical documents. But it so happens that the history of the Fourth Gospel supplies us with a name to which part or the whole of the book may be attributed. This is the name of John the Presbyter or Elder, mentioned in a fragment of Papias. We have already considered, in connexion with the evidence of Papias, the very few fragments of what can be called fact about the Presbyter.<sup>1</sup> As we have remarked before, the existence of the name, with the possibility of a real man behind it, gives these suggestions a somewhat more solid appearance than many. But in face of the more tangible elements in the external evidence the name serves little purpose but to keep the book out of the hands of the Apostolic circle. And this reduces the Presbyter to the level of a theoretical expedient. If it be said that theories such as this, even with all their

<sup>1</sup> *C. Q. R.* No. 119 (April 1905), pp. 102, 103.

difficulties, are preferable to believing in the Johannine authorship and that the teaching of the book is traceable to our Lord, we can hardly regard such a statement as a happy example of free criticism. For we can scarcely look upon a critical inquiry as being conducted freely, or even fairly, if the alternative for which there is the greatest weight of positive evidence is shut out *a priori* as an impossibility.

The theories to which we have just referred are, we may say, of the ordinary type, and our theoretical objection to them is that they indulge unduly in unverified hypothesis. We cannot leave the subject without referring to a theory of a very novel character, propounded in Dr. Abbott's book, *The Letter and the Spirit*. Dr. Abbott regards the author of the Gospel as having been a thoughtful and spiritually-minded Christian, who, though he had never seen our Lord, felt himself to be in continual intercourse with Him. Hence, when he says he heard and saw, we must not suppose him to mean that he was present on any particular historical occasion, or that St. John, from whom ultimately he derived his teaching, was so present. St. John himself would, apparently, only mean that he saw—'as clearly as any of the numerous visions that he "saw" at Patmos' (p. 9). The Evangelist would only 'develop, explain, and amplify the nucleus of truth bequeathed by St. John; and in so doing might unfortunately lead later ages to suppose, and perhaps might himself suppose, that [the vision] was literally and materially true' (*ibid.*). The Evangelist's relation to St. John being thus described, we inquire what is the relation to our Lord. It is here that the most remarkable part of Dr. Abbott's theory comes to light. Sayings of our Lord, he maintains, which were originally uttered in Aramaic, were partly mistaken—construed literally when they were only metaphorical, and the like—partly translated into dialects of Hebrew and Greek, losing much of their character in the process. To these very imperfect traditions Dr. Abbott traces many of the stories in the Synoptic Gospels. The Fourth Evangelist, having in his possession the teaching gradually evolved by St. John, and being also revolted by the thaumaturgic and unworthy conceptions of our Lord prevailing at the time, puts forward a

Gospel in which he calls men's minds away from the current type of tradition to what seems to him the living Voice of the Son of Man. This view is supported, among many other arguments, by a very remarkable exegesis of the verses in which the Evangelist refers to other facts and other books about our Lord.

'If he disliked as unspiritual and suspected as untrue a large number of books that were "being written," and some that were already written, about Christ's "mighty works," would not this explain his extraordinary unwillingness—at least it appears unwillingness—that men should go on writing "the things that were *done* by Jesus?" . . . "The universe," he says—"if people go on indefinitely piling up such writings—will be more than filled!"'

Epictetus had expressed himself weary of Stoic maxims and anxious for the man to put them into practice.

'For Stoic maxims substitute "miracles" or "exorcisms," such legends as that of the Gadarene and the two thousand swine, or the withering of the fig-tree—all of them, even if true, only so far useful as they threw light on the personality of the Lord, but probably neither true nor useful; and then we have an insight into the feelings of our Evangelist, who had certainly read Epictetus, and who felt, with him, that *what was wanting in the Church was not "books" but "the man"*' (pp. 357-8).

What we have, then, in the Fourth Gospel is, apparently, an ideal picture of the Lord, evolved by the spiritual insight of the Evangelist, based partly on the 'visions' and 'interpretations' which the Apostle John had left behind him, over against a coarse and corrupt tradition in which positive blunders, together with the Hebrew habit of 'Targumizing,' had perverted the truth. The Fourth Gospel is the Spirit, the corrupt tradition the Letter.

We agree with Dr. Abbott that men required continually to be recalled to the Person of Jesus Christ, and that the Fourth Gospel conspicuously performs this service; and we are glad to see that he criticizes the speculative assumption of documents. Also, we regard with profound respect the recondite learning which he has brought to bear on his theory. But the theory as a whole seems to us to fail more signally even than those which we have already rejected. We do not deny



that confusion may arise in the course of translations from one language to another ; we do not deny that Hebrew teachers amplified and expounded the text which they used as the basis of their teaching. But though these are *verae causae*, it seems to us that Dr. Abbott totally fails to prove that they were actually in operation in the Gospels, and that his theory leads to this paradoxical result :—Christianity, which has undoubtedly depended on the Gospels as they are, has rested on an illusion, which itself was the outcome of a series of transparent blunders. In spite of his learning, Dr. Abbott has, surely, woven us as unsubstantial a fabric as any that was ever offered by a scholar. Such misfortunes do sometimes befall scholars. Bentley's notes to Milton's *Paradise Lost* are full of sound learning : the amanuensis and corrector of the proofs are *verae causae*, since Milton was blind. But there is scarcely a single emendation proposed by Bentley which is remotely probable. Bentley forgot the poetry when he was criticizing Milton : Dr. Abbott seems to us to have forgotten the nature and probabilities of historic fact.

There is one point more, on which we must touch in conclusion. What is the importance of the Johannine question to the Church? It is sometimes contended that with the Apostolic authorship of this Gospel Christianity must stand or fall. If this book should turn out to be by some unknown and later hand, one of the bulwarks of the Faith will have disappeared. We do not wish to identify ourselves with this position—at least in this form. But it does seem to us true that the Christology of the Gospel is necessary to Christianity, if, at any rate, we are to claim continuity with the past ages of the Church. To surrender the belief in the Incarnate Logos, with all that it implies in the Doctrine of God and in the Redemption of Man, seems to us to surrender the distinctive features of the old Faith. And the Fourth Gospel is more than a brilliant treatise on these theological subjects : it professes to be an historical record by one who witnessed the presence of the Incarnate Word on this earth. If it be possible to attain the truth, in which so much Christian life and experience has centred, and to attain it, not merely as a speculative idea, but as a realized historical fact, and yet to



regard the Fourth Gospel as doubtfully authentic or certainly spurious, then, of course, the Johannine question is of secondary importance. But we think that the possibility of this point of view still requires to be shewn, and that those who commend it to us, or who are seriously shaken by critical assaults on the Gospel, should be very careful to make clear to us and to themselves the form of creed which remains to them, and the basis on which it rests.

#### ART. VI.—CREIGHTON AND STUBBS.

1. *Letters of William Stubbs, Bishop of Oxford, 1825-1901.* Edited by WILLIAM HOLDEN HUTTON, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ely. (London: Constable and Co., 1904.)
2. *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Mediæval and Modern History and Kindred Subjects delivered at Oxford under statutory obligation in the years 1867-1884.* With two Addresses given at Oxford and Reading by W. Stubbs, D.D., Bishop of Oxford, &c. Third Edition. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1900.)
3. *Charges delivered to the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Diocese.* By WILLIAM STUBBS, D.D., Bishop of Oxford. Second Charge, 1893. Fourth Charge, 1899. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.)
4. *Historical Lectures and Addresses by Mandell Creighton, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., &c.,* sometime Bishop of London. Edited by LOUISE CREIGHTON. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1903.)
5. *Life and Letters of Mandell Creighton, D.D. Oxon. and Cam.,* sometime Bishop of London, &c., &c. By his WIFE. With Portraits and other Illustrations. Two vols. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1904.)

SELDOM have English literature and the Church of England suffered in the same year so heavy a loss as that of the signal services of Bishops Stubbs and Creighton. In closely allied,

yet widely distinct, spheres of action both had made for themselves a world-wide reputation. If one was more illustrious as an historian and the other as a prelate, each filled both *roles* with far more than average success. Creighton indeed stood out as a born ruler of men, and by singular rapidity of insight and inborn brilliancy commanded with almost dangerous facility a foremost place in every position he assumed. Stubbs laboriously acquired with infinite pains the incomparable mastery over a wide field of history which stamped his work with unquestioned authority. Both men were essentially big. Both were gifted with that force of character—the Americans call it grit—so distinctive of the northern counties of England, from which they sprang. Both had disadvantages in early life—those of Stubbs were far the heavier—which elicited at an early age self-reliance and self-control that were priceless in after years. Each was successively parish priest, university professor of history, canon residentiary, and holder in turn of two English bishoprics. The contrast and comparison of character may be pursued further, but we must first glance briefly at the records of their lives now before us.

The biographies are constructed on very different lines. Mr. Hutton's volume must be regarded (as he claims for it) 'as primarily a collection of letters,' to which is added 'such an account of his life as makes them intelligible to those who did not know him.'<sup>1</sup> Mr. Hutton enters upon his task with an adequate estimate of its importance, and challenges for Stubbs the proud title of the great English historian of the nineteenth century—the intellectual peer of Bishop Butler, the historical of the author of *The Decline and Fall*. If we are as yet too near to place such great names together in trustworthy perspective, we can sympathize ungrudgingly with Mr. Hutton's admiration, and it is in no carping spirit that we express a fear that 'the letters' will be found by some rather dry reading. All that concerns the bishop's own life is full of interest. The early struggles, the obscure but unwearied studiousness of his undergraduate career as a servitor of Christ Church—in short, every phase of his laborious life sparkles

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of Stubbs*, p. v.

with the caustic humour which lights continually his massive learning. But a large section of the correspondence, notably that with Freeman, could only attract a specialist, and is occasionally unintelligible to the reader who is not versed in chronological and genealogical problems of the Norman era.

Mrs. Creighton, at the outset, anticipates and deprecates the complaint that her exhaustive and masterly biography is too prolix. Yet it is difficult to be too grateful for this complete and finished picture of a life so full and so varied. From schoolboy days to his last hours at Fulham, Creighton stands out in high relief and clear outline, in every stage of his development, in his wife's vivid pages. Broadly speaking, the biography has the defects of its qualities, and in its elaborate minuteness somewhat lacks due sense of the proportionate importance of things, a failing from which Creighton himself was not entirely free. Such minor duties as attendance at boards of guardians and diocesan inspection of schools need not be undervalued because they are passed over with the briefest mention in the life of a professor of history and a great bishop.

Stubbs' early career repeats the well-worn story of many a learned Churchman. Through the death of his father he was left in childhood in such straitened circumstances as would have rendered a university training hopeless if the intervention of Bishop Longley had not obtained for him a servitorship at Christ Church. A highly affectionate disposition and a singular fondness for tracing pedigrees and mastering the local antiquarian lore of Knaresborough and the neighbourhood, a passion which clung to him through life and was of supreme value in his historical research, were the marked features of his boyhood. The cruel discipline at Ripon Grammar School did not in his case cripple the thirst for knowledge and persevering industry, the remarkable accuracy and the prodigious memory which were amongst his most conspicuous gifts. His isolated position as a poor servitor and his natural reserve were gradually broken through under the warm approbation of the college authorities and the intimacy of a few close friends, and when he obtained a first in *Litterae Humaniores* in 1848, and a Fellowship in the same

year at Trinity, there were many who, like Pusey, lamented that, owing to a matter of form, he was lost to Christ Church. His intimates included the foremost of his contemporaries who were upholders of Church principles in that day of advancing liberalism. During the long vacation of 1849 he took a small reading party to St. David's—amongst them Henry Parry Liddon, his future colleague at St. Paul's. On May 26 of the following year he was ordained priest at Cuddesdon, and the next day accepted the college living of Navestock.

The seventeen years passed as a country parson at Navestock laid wide and deep the foundations upon which the splendid structures of after years were raised. The spirit in which the new vicar entered upon his work found expression in lines, reproduced by Mr. Hutton, which testify to the sweet content and modesty of their author:—

‘ Is not this  
As fair a portion of my Master’s garden  
As ever was blessed in Eden? Who am I  
To till and keep the souls that surely draw  
Some inspiration from the scenes they dwell in?’<sup>1</sup>

All the duties of the cure were most conscientiously performed, and historical study was never allowed to encroach upon the time or strength required by the multifarious calls of parochial work. Daily services, diligent visiting, excellent sermons, were all compassed by a life of extreme regularity and careful routine. All the morning was spent in his study, all the afternoon in visiting, which was his constitutional walk; in the evening came newspapers and reading. The even tenor of Stubbs’ life was not changed by his marriage to Miss Catherine Dellar in 1859, although the birth of seven children in the next sixteen years must have added some anxiety at times about ways and means. Life at Navestock was indeed a splendid example of simple living and high thinking; diversified by occasional pupils, one of whom was Mr. Algernon Swinburne—then a Balliol undergraduate, of

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of Stubbs*, p. 35.

whom Jowett wrote that no good would come 'unless he can be hindered from writing poetry'—and enriched by keen interest in current ecclesiastical problems. A brief quotation will help to illustrate the extent and variety of Stubbs' historical studies at Navestock :—

'He edited Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History* and added a valuable continuation of his own. In 1861 he edited from the Cotton MS. Julius D. 6, collated with the Harleian MS. 3, 776 the tract *De Inventione Sanctæ Crucis nostræ in Monte Acuto et de ductione ejusdem apud Waltham*, with an account, showing his power of close and exact investigation, of the foundation of Waltham Abbey. In 1862 he contributed to the *Gentleman's Magazine* a paper on the Bishops of Man and the Isles, based in the first place on Professor Munch's edition of the chronicle (Christiania, 1860); in the same year a letter on a charter relating to the Canons of Waltham; and in later years letters on Bishop Savaric of Wells, on Lambeth degrees, and on the foundation statute of the Provostry of Wells. In 1861 he read a paper on the foundation and early *Fasti* of Peterborough to the Archaeological Institute, and in 1862 one on the Ecclesiastical History of Worcester in the eighth century. In 1865 he wrote an extremely interesting and valuable letter to a Russian friend on the Apostolic Succession in the Church of England. All these papers ought to be collected with other writings even less known and placed in the hands of the public.<sup>1</sup>

These productions, which called for wide and minute research, were only *πάρεργα* interspersed amongst labours which first blossomed in the *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum*, published in 1858. The book was 'an attempt to exhibit the courses of episcopal succession in England, and was offered as a contribution to Ecclesiastical History in the departments of Biography and exact Chronology.' The toil it involved was immense, and was unlikely to reap any adequate reward; but 'it started its author on the path of mediæval history with the equipment of a first-hand knowledge of many of its original sources.'

His position as a writer of extraordinary accuracy and width of learning was assured, although it was not till five years later, in 1863, that it was officially recognized by his

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of Stubbs*, pp. 53-4.

selection to edit the Chronicles and Memorials of the reign of Richard I. for the Rolls Series. In the preceding year he had been made Librarian at Lambeth, when his old patron, Dr. Longley, was moved from York to Canterbury.

The Master of the Rolls' commission was the crucial moment in Stubbs' career. It devoted him to a congenial task which called forth the willing exercise of all his powers. It opened out a field of research in which he was already an adept explorer, quickened his absorbing passion for historical study, supplied magnificent opportunities for the display of the stern love of truth which distinguished alike his intellectual and his moral nature, elicited his singular sobriety of judgement, his unwearied patience, his skill in palæography, his enthusiasm in tracing the origin of institutions and in working out great principles. Mr. Hutton claims for Stubbs, and claims justly, that

'his was no view derived from others' researches. He had read the manuscripts, fixed the readings, investigated difficult passages, for himself. His conclusions were based upon as thorough a study as man ever gave to any subject that concerned the life of man. The introductions to the Rolls Series were the summing up of the work of years. They went near to being the final word on every subject with which they dealt.'<sup>1</sup>

And the result was a complete revolution in our conception of English mediæval history. The work begun in 1863 was carried on continuously till 1889, and embraced *The Constitutional History of England*, nine volumes of the Rolls Series, Appendices to the Report of the Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts; besides minor historical writings whose bare titles fill several octavo pages and a long series of contributions to Smith and Wace's Dictionaries of *Christian Biography* and *Antiquities*. Many of these required enormous research absolutely incommensurate with any popular appreciation of its value. But to Stubbs the minutest fact, the most obscure date, the most tangled genealogy were important and were conscientiously traced out with scrupulous and most cheerful exactness.

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of Stubbs*, p. 57.

We select from Mr. Hutton's instances of Stubbs' nervous power of expression a single typical example which he presents as a fascinating study of heredity and a moral judgement based on fullest knowledge and widest charity :—

'All the Plantagenet kings were high-hearted men, rather rebellious against circumstances than subservient to them. But the long pageant shows us uniformly, under so great a variety of individual character, such signs of great gifts and opportunities thrown away, such unscrupulousness in action, such uncontrolled passion, such vast energy and strength wasted on unworthy aims, such constant failure and final disappointment, in spite of constant successes and brilliant achievements, as remind us of the conduct and luck of those unhappy spirits who, throughout the Middle Ages, were continually spending superhuman strength in building in a night inaccessible bridges and uninhabitable castles, or purchasing with untold treasures souls that might have been had for nothing, and invariably cheated of their reward.

'Only two in the whole list strike us as free from the hereditary sins: Edward I. and Henry VI., the noblest and the unhappiest of the race; and of these the former owes his real greatness in history, not to the success of his personal ambition, but to the brilliant qualities brought out by the exigencies of his affairs; while on the latter, both as a man and as a king, fell the heaviest crash of accumulated misery. None of the others seem to have had a wish to carry out the true grand conception of kingship. And thus it is with the extinction of the male line of Plantagenet that the social happiness of the English people begins. Even Henry VII., though, perhaps, as selfish a man as any of his predecessors, and certainly less cared for or beloved, seems to open an era during which the vices of the monarchs have been less disastrous to their subjects than before, and the prosperity of the State has increased in no proportion to the ability of the kings.

'And yet no two of these princes were alike in the constituent proportions of their temperament. The leading feature of one was falsehood, of another cruelty, of another licentiousness, of another unscrupulous ambition; one was the slave of women, another of untrustworthy favourites, one a raiser of taxes, another the shedder of the blood of his people. Yet there was not one thoroughly contemptible person in the list. Many had redeeming qualities, some had great ones; all had a certain lion-like nobility, some had a portion of the real elements of greatness. Some were wise, all were brave; some were pure in life, some gentle as well as strong; but is



it too hard to say that all were thoroughly selfish, all were in the main unfortunate?

'In the character of Henry II. are found all the characteristics of this race. Not the greatest, nor the wisest, nor the worst, nor the most unfortunate, he still unites all these in their greatest relative proportions. Not so impetuous as Richard, or Edward III., or Henry V., nor so wise as Edward I.; not so luxurious as John or Edward IV.; not so false as Henry III., nor so greedy as Henry IV., nor so cruel as the princes of the house of York; he was still eminently wise and brave, eminently cruel, lascivious, greedy and false, and eminently unfortunate also, if the ruin of all the selfish aims of his sagacious plans, the disappointment of his affections, and the sense of having lost his soul for nothing, can be called misfortune.'<sup>1</sup>

The brief interval between 1862 and 1865 had placed Stubbs among the first scholars of the day, and his unsolicited appointment in the latter year by Lord Derby to the chair of Modern History at Oxford was cordially approved by the most competent judges. By none was it welcomed more heartily than by his two intimate friends Freeman and J. R. Green, whose prejudices were yet shocked by the recognition in his Inaugural Lecture of the innate distinction between Ancient and Modern History, against which Freeman always vigorously protested, and by its religious close, which offended the ardent 'Liberalism' of the younger historian. No man knew better than Stubbs the reception which his outspoken avowal of faith in God's overruling guidance of the world would obtain in the prevailing temper of the University, but he was at no pains to conceal his convictions.

'There is,' he said, 'I speak humbly in common with Natural Science, in the study of Living History a gradual approximation to a consciousness that we are growing into a perception of the workings of the Almighty Ruler of the world; that we are growing able to justify the Eternal Wisdom and by that justification to approve ourselves His children; that we are coming to see, not only in His ruling of His Church in her spiritual character, but in His overruling of the world, to which His act of redemption has given a new and all interesting character to His own people, a hand of justice and mercy, a hand of progress and order, a kind and wise disposition,

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of Stubbs*, pp. 62, 63.

ever leading the world on to the better, but never forcing, and out of the evil of man's working bringing continually that which is good. I do not fear to put it before you in this shape; I state my own belief, and it is well that you should know it from the first.<sup>1</sup>

Stubbs found Oxford greatly changed. A spirit of crude Liberalism was rampant, and his feelings regarding it found expression in his selection of 'The days are evil' as the text for his first University sermon. 'With a few notable exceptions,' he said, 'the whole popular press is ostensibly and implacably set against religion.' In view of the real danger, which then seemed imminent, it is cheering to recall utterances which are no less pertinent and applicable at the present hour. From the study of history, he held,

'the Church has everything to gain; from the critical examination of every existing movement, from the cultivation of a critical habit in every thinking being, the ministers of religion have nothing to fear, everything to hope. But from the exaggerations of imaginary discoveries, from the warped and narrow conclusions of special investigations, from the same unhappy one-sidedness which is the overweening temptation of the scientific mind much scandal does originate and many are led astray.'<sup>2</sup>

The hope of the Church lay in more prayer, more intelligent prayer; in more work, more devoted work.

His own life at Oxford set a splendid example of unwearyed and strenuous labour. For the pleasures of social life he had little inclination, and he was impatient of their interference with his simple and scholarly habits. In his entire absorption in study he begrudged its interruption by preparation for the two statutory lectures he was obliged to deliver annually: a task which he held could be adequately performed by the college historical tutors, and which was not rendered more grateful by the scant audience which attended them. The man who was deeply immersed in books which demanded such continuous effort as *The Constitutional History of England*, and editing, with A. G. Haddon, the *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents of Great Britain and Ireland*—books of world-wide reputation—might perhaps

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of Stubbs*, pp. 116, 117.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 126, 127.

have been spared any less congenial task ; but *The Lectures and Addresses on Mediæval and Modern History* shew how thoroughly he entered on it ; and, despite an unattractive delivery, he amused his hearers by the quaintest jokes, which none enjoyed more heartily than himself. When the quality of his work is considered, Stubbs' output during his eighteen years at Oxford is simply stupendous.

Never was promotion more appropriate than when, on Lightfoot's appointment to Durham, Stubbs was selected for the vacant canonry at St. Paul's. His one conspicuous service whilst canon was as a member of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts appointed by Mr. Gladstone in 1881. On this large and influential body which, besides the Archbishops and other prelates, included Lord Chief Justice Coleridge and a very powerful quota of lawyers, Stubbs championed almost single-handed the constitutional liberties of the Church against the Erastianism—avowed or implicit—of the majority of its members. We may quote Mr. Hutton's concise account of Stubbs' share in the proceedings :

'Dr. Stubbs was present at every one of the seventy-five sessions of the Commission, from May 1881 to July 1883. He gave evidence himself, he presented a special paper to the Commission, and he supplied five historical appendices to the Report, dealing with (1) the Court which exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction up to 1832 ; (2) the Heresy trials up to 1533 ; (3) the formal Act by which the clergy recognised the Royal Supremacy ; (4) a collation of the *Lords' Journals* with the *Convocation Records*, 1529-47 ; (5) a list of occasions on which the Convocations were formally referred to in matters other than financial. Nothing [Mr. Hutton adds] in our generation has done more to impress upon the public the true position and claims of the Church of England than these lucid and exhaustive summaries.'<sup>1</sup>

The evidence thus presented was backed up by a paper of suggestions concerning the Supreme Court of Appeal and the historical questions to be considered, which so greatly influenced the Commission and the Report that Stubbs was able to sign it without reservation. The struggle had been a hard

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of Stubbs*, p. 205.

one, and had at times cost him dear. 'If I showed a fraction of the irritation I felt I must have seemed cantankerous,' he wrote to Dean Church, 'and this makes me unhappy, for I may lower the cause, and I know my manner has not the repose that marks the caste of Archbishops.' But the courage of his convictions, added to his unique mastery of the question, enabled him to stand up against the lawyers, and he was satisfied that the best that was possible under existing circumstances had been done, that the authority of the Judicial Committee had been effectually sapped, and that priceless information had been acquired which would temper any future legislation.

There can be no question that it was with a sense of real sacrifice that Stubbs accepted his nomination by Mr. Gladstone to the bishopric of Chester. He was giving up associations of precious and closest intimacy at St. Paul's; he was practically renouncing all hope of future historical research; he was foregoing an income adequate to his simple requirements in exchange for the multifarious and novel anxieties of a bishopric seriously crippled by Dr. Jacobson's retiring pension; he was forfeiting great literary opportunities in London and Oxford, and the life which long habit had made a second nature, to undertake in his sixtieth year new and untried responsibilities. Nowhere does the grand simplicity and firm yet modest faith of the man shine forth more strongly than in his letters at this period. We select, as specially germane to this article, some extracts from Creighton's letter to Stubbs and his reply:

'I dare not congratulate you,' Creighton wrote, 'on your elevation to the office of Bishop, because I know too well how much labour and responsibility it involves, and I know that in consenting to take it you have not followed your own inclinations, but a sense of duty. Indeed, Lightfoot's example has left you no option. But I must say this—that for the sake of the Church I think it is the very best thing that has happened for many years. . . . I think that your accession to the Bench will bring strength everywhere it is needed. Your large knowledge of everything connected with the history, position and principles of the Church will be of invaluable usefulness. Your statesmanlike views and your experience of affairs will secure universal attention.'

'My dear Creighton,' was the answer, 'your kind letter—the kindest of the two hundred kind ones that I have received—has warmed my heart very thoroughly. I am very grateful for it. I feel not at all sure that my rashness has in it the element of faith, but I trust that it has, and I am quite sure that anyone who knows what I am leaving will acquit me, on this point, of self-seeking. . . . As for the work that lies before me, I see some advantages and some rather exhausting demands on time and thought. What for seventeen years has been my work will have to become my relaxation, as it was at Navestock, and as yours is at Embleton. I want all my friends to have me in their hearts in the most serious times and places. I feel no hesitation in asking this of you.'<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Hutton tells us that when he was preparing his edition of the *Letters* a friend said to him with some superfluous anxiety, 'Whatever you do, do not make out that Stubbs was a great bishop.' The standard of appreciation of course varies widely, and if by episcopal greatness is meant the constant exercise of popular gifts so as to loom largely before the public eye and to gratify the public taste, Bishop Stubbs would not hold, possibly would not have wished to hold, the highest place. But the scholar and recluse abundantly justified his selection by his energetic devotion to the necessities, then very urgent, of his northern diocese, and by his penetration in reading character, as well as by the wisdom and learning with which he handled the problems which were pressing on the whole Anglican Church. He issued a commission of inquiry into the spiritual needs of his diocese early in 1885, and faced with indomitable perseverance the task of carrying out its recommendations at an estimated cost of 84,000*l.*, and himself subscribed 1,000*l.* towards it. Whilst he retained his simple mode of living, his liberality was very great, and at times reached half his official income. With an abhorrence of show and grandeur, with a detestation of pretence occasionally manifested in startling and caustic pleasantry, which caused him to be misunderstood, with deep personal piety and invincible determination to do his duty, behind a boyish love of fun and harmless mischief,

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of Stubbs*, pp. 246, 247.

he shewed himself from the very commencement of his episcopate humbly conscious of his responsibility and fully determined to act up to it first as Bishop of Chester and then as a bishop of England.

We are constrained to pass over many tempting details illustrative of Stubbs' episcopate at Chester and Oxford. His translation to the University See brought anxieties which weighed heavily on the Bishop's heart. The parade and expense involved in keeping up Cuddesdon, the time wasted, owing to its position, in journeys to distant parts of the diocese, the scattered area over three counties of dissimilar interests and industries, augmented the worries inseparable from the incessant round of episcopal engagements. Then, his position as an assessor in the Lincoln Case, which he felt most reluctantly obliged to accept, was a sore trial. He had strong misgivings about the constitution of the tribunal, and he felt with real bitterness of sorrow how trivial the matters were over which so much animosity was displayed. His impatience found relief in humorous notes to his chaplain. Here is a specimen :

'We are discussing forms and ceremonies. Oh, the wearying weariness of it all ! Once the earth was without form and void, now it is full of forms and has not ceased to be void, judging by empty heads and hard chairs. Certainly this Court is quite informal and the subject devoid of all interest. One feels inclined to deal with forms without any ceremony, and with ceremonies without much formality. When we are Archbishops we will reform the performances of these high-jinkers.'<sup>1</sup>

Through all he retained immense admiration for the Archbishop. 'Benson is wonderful,' he wrote ; 'he knows all about it, and has his authorities on the spot at the right moment.' With the Judgement when delivered he expressed entire agreement, and would not tolerate anything which it decided to be illegal.

We cordially acquiesce in Mr. Hutton's dictum that it is in the four charges which Stubbs delivered as Bishop of Oxford that his greatness as a prelate may be seen, and

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of Stubbs*, pp. 326, 327.

without committing ourselves to all his conclusions we would specially commend them as models of sound learning, moderate expression, and critical judgement on burning questions. It is impossible within the space at our command to summarize addresses which handle in the most condensed form so many deep problems. Education, Ritual, Relations of Church and State, Disestablishment and Disendowment; the Papal Letters, the Lambeth Conference, the Marriage Question; Protestantism, Tractarianism, Sacerdotalism; Discipline, Ecclesiastical Courts, Church Reform—the charges are an armoury from which Churchmen may equip themselves for the battle perpetually raging round one or more of these topics, and even the best furnished readers will profit by their breadth of view, lucidity of insight, and masterly grasp of the true issue. Shall we give as an example the Bishop's reply to the sophism so persistently being urged at the present moment that definite religious teaching in elementary schools is sectarian and formalist, and may well give way to moral and undenominational instruction? Our quotation is from the second Oxford Charge delivered in 1893:

'To the answer that we teach formally and for sectarian ends there can be one reply—one reply to both clauses of it. Children cannot be taught without forms, and the forms by which Churchmen try to teach them are the forms in which they themselves express what they believe necessary for the purposes for which they employ them. Children cannot be taught the substance of any lesson without a form; the alphabet, the spelling-book, the multiplication-table, the first lesson of grammar and arithmetic are quite as much a formula as the Church Catechism; the only way of learning at all is through the use of means, the exact *rationale* of which is not and cannot be understood until the lesson is learned. We try to teach our children the law of faith, repentance and obedience, so that when they come to the time when these shall be consciously the law of their life, they may find that they have some equipment towards the work of their struggle and opportunity; and we confess that we do want them to be taught what we believe to be true, and how to find what we believe to be the sure way of eternal life. If that is sectarianism, and if such sectarianism is a drawback on Christian liberty and on the free development of religious consciousness, so much the worse for those who have made it so. We have not made it sectarian, if it



is so ; but whether sectarian or not, it is what we want and what we do not mean to forego if we can help it.<sup>1</sup>

We have not space to enter into the Bishop's dicta on the vexed and intricate question of the origin and statutory obligation of tithes, or to quote as we would gladly have done at length the seventeen brief statements of the relations between Church and State, which he put before the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission and repeated in his final Charge. He was at once an ardent supporter of the existing union between the two powers, and keenly anxious to uphold at all costs the Church's spiritual authority and independence. In determining any future ecclesiastical legislation he was persuaded that the law to be declared must be the law of the Church of England as it has existed in practice since the abolition of the Papal power. At a moment when the claim of the Canon Law to override English Church law is being strongly pressed it is well to repeat the unhesitating decision of our greatest constitutional authority, one who was himself a High Churchman of the stoutest courage.

'I cannot regard the *Corpus Juris Canonici* as containing for individual clergymen any directive authority. Whatever may have been its status as compared with Common Law and Statute Law before the Reformation, and its relation to the administration of the Courts in England—and on this, as some of you may be aware, my own conclusions have been seriously questioned by lawyers and clergy lately—I cannot believe that there ever was a time when it was possible, or that there is now a right for anyone bound by loyal sanctions to the law of the Church of England, and the authority which he acknowledges in his ordination, to pick out of a great mass of jurisprudence, most of whose conditions are altogether passed away, a system by which he should consider himself, his conscience or his school, to be bound. And if not in the *Corpus Juris*, how can it be found in the text and rubrics of the Missal or other Service-books which were and are explicitly disavowed in the Church and her services, as well as in her jurisprudence.'<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Hutton's final pages give us a striking example of the ruling passion, strong in death, and manifest all Stubbs' early interest in Yorkshire records of pedigrees and bells. In sadly

<sup>1</sup> *Second Charge*, p. 66.

<sup>2</sup> *Fourth Charge*, pp. 44-5.

broken health he braced himself to preach in St. George's Chapel the day after the funeral of Queen Victoria, to whom he was devoted with a chivalrous and admiring loyalty. In the audience were three reigning monarchs and three direct heirs to a throne. It was a supreme effort, and worthy of its great occasion. Three months later he entered into rest.

The keynote to Bishop Creighton's life is to be found in his own words written during the period of his engagement. 'I begin,' he said, 'from within. I lead my own life.' The phrase describes with singular exactness his career from childhood to the grave. He lost his mother when he was seven years old, and his father was a stern, reserved man who, so long as his children were obedient and industrious, let them follow their own inclinations, but had no sympathy with his son Mandell's preference for scholarship with a view to Holy Orders over his own flourishing business as an upholsterer at Carlisle. A passion for long walks, an ardent admiration for beautiful scenery, and an innate aptitude for classical work were early and persistent characteristics, and were combined with natural cleverness, which sometimes tempted him to rely on sudden effort rather than on steady application. To these should be added a singular genius for friendship and a steadfast independence of character, and we have the leading features of the portraiture so skilfully drawn in Mrs. Creighton's volumes. Under the finished scholarship of Dr. Holden at Durham Grammar School he rapidly became proficient in Greek, Latin, and English composition, and in three years reached the top of the school. A postmastership at Merton, won in 1862, was followed in due course by a first in Moderations, and in *Litterae Humaniores*. Although owing to insufficient time for preparation he only obtained a second in the Law and History School, the ability of his papers impressed the examiners—Professor Stubbs, Mr. Boase, and Mr. James Bryce—all afterwards close friends and colleagues.

We are constrained to pass over a remarkable letter which Creighton called his 'pastoral,' on the responsibility of prefects, written shortly after he left school, to his successor

as head boy at Durham. Nor can we linger upon his career as fellow and tutor, his engagement and marriage, and his anxious consideration of the comparative desirability of Oxford or Embleton, a college living which fell vacant in 1871. The prevailing fashion of incorporating a copious selection from a man's love letters into his biography is certainly justified here by the exceptionally high quality of the correspondence, and by the insight which it affords into a mind of rarest temper. With all his ability, and with the opportunity for self-culture which he duly valued, he felt strongly that he had duties towards those of every class with whom he was brought in contact.

'I think nothing is more untrue than to value lowly social influences ; the work of culture is to be done as much by private as by public talk, as much by unauthoritative utterances at a dinner-table, as by solemn ones in the pulpit or the newspaper.<sup>1</sup> . . . If you are doing any work it will be recognisable enough ; if you are not, begin contentedly in a little way at first. Such is my theory of life : it took me a long while to learn ; but since I have given up regenerating mankind by the million, I find it very hard to satisfy myself about my own wisdom in the smallest duties of life, still more about the goodness of my intentions and the singleness of heart in the process. It is very hard to get rid of one's lower self—to be utterly unpretentious, truthful and charitable all at once.<sup>2</sup> . . . I am most deeply grieved when I think that D——'s appearance, manners, peculiarities stood in my way of doing what I might have done. . . . I have felt that it was hard for him to be condemned to loneliness, to be cheered by scanty sympathy on his course, which was an honest, hard-fought one, because his voice was loud, and other little matters. I feel that I have weakly disregarded a noble human soul because it had an unsightly body ; and now he is gone and I cannot ask his pardon or make amends. I tell you this that you may be spared a similar thought ; it is well to feel in the presence of the great issues of life how mean, how ignoble, how thoroughly unworthy is any social standard—how goodness of soul is the only thing one ought to care about, and that up to the fullest of one's conviction, on that point, ought one's acts to be.<sup>3</sup> . . . I wish you would study Goethe more, and grasp his doctrine of *Entsagung*, the doctrine that morality consists in the consciousness of self, and freedom and content are to be obtained only by the recognition of one's

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Creighton*, vol. i. p. 82.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 103.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 105.

limits and by self-identification with them ; so that what first appears as an iron barrier set before us by remorseless destiny, is by the mere process of its moral recognition transformed into an internal precept for our moral guidance, becomes a help rather than a hindrance, for it makes life more definite and its problem more soluble.<sup>1</sup>

We make no apology for inserting these extracts, which are genuine revelations of *la vie intime*. They were not mere sentimental opinions, but express the habitual practice of a very full life. Creighton was never too busy to help anyone, of whatever age or social status, who turned to him for advice, and he took infinite pains in matters which he might well have been excused for passing by on the plea of engrossing occupations. This abiding sympathy should be borne in mind in any estimate formed from Creighton's conversation in after years, when possibly the intense pressure of London life and the rapidity of his interest in every form of modern culture occasionally seemed to indicate too much care for merely worldly things. The breadth of his culture, which embraced so many and multifarious topics, enabled him to throw himself into a discussion of the most diverse questions, and tended to conceal, perhaps too frequently, the strong religious convictions which really moulded his daily course.

Creighton's life at Embleton must have been an ideal one for a country parson devoted to parochial work and with literary tastes. Enough labour to satisfy energy, enough income to banish sordid care, enough society to secure variety and interchange of thought, enough leisure to indulge a passion for historical study. It does not fall to every country vicar to have such neighbours as the Greys of Howick and Fullofen, or the Hodgkins, the Peases, and the Trevelyan, in more distant parts of the county ; who, with Oxford friends and an occasional pupil, helped to stimulate thought and to preserve from intellectual stagnation. It was a goodly heritage and Creighton knew how to make the most of it. The great event of the nine years at Embleton was the preparation and publication of the first two volumes of the *History of the Papacy*, which appeared in October, 1882, and, with all allowance for the severest criticism, at

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Creighton*, vol. i. p. 106.

once placed Creighton in the front rank of living English historians.

It is a singular omission in most literary biographies that we have no account of the method in which the authors set about their work. In the lives of such scholars as Westcott, or in the case of the two eminent men before us, it would have been interesting to know something of the process by which they gradually accumulated their vast stores of knowledge. It is the speciality of an expert to determine which authorities are really trustworthy, and where they are to be met with. When Creighton had decided on leaving Oxford Mark Pattison growled, 'What are you going into the country for? To study history? You can't study history without a library, and you can't get an adequate historical library unless you spend at least 1,000*l.* a year on books.' Yet Lord Acton, when reviewing the first two volumes of the *Popes*, remarked that Creighton spoke with regret of his imperfect command of books, but it was right (he added) to expose the guile which lurks in this apology. The Northumbrian vicarage in which Bulæus and Traversari are as familiar as Burnet must be a rare and enviable spot, and we should have been glad to learn how so enormous a difficulty had been surmounted. It was a fitting reward of the use made of the leisure which Embleton afforded that Creighton was summoned to Cambridge as Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and settled there towards the close of 1884.

'It is difficult in a biography,' Creighton wrote on one occasion, 'to exhibit side by side the course of a man's outward life and also of his inward life'<sup>1</sup>; and it is the completeness with which this twofold aspect is presented in these volumes of a life so full and varied, and a mind so rapid and many-sided, which makes a reviewer despair of adequate treatment in a very condensed notice. Professorial work at Cambridge, with its lectures and personal intercourse with historical students of both sexes, a canonry at Worcester, with the activities that suggested themselves to restless energy, the editorship of the *English Historical Review*, with the correspondence and anxiety involved in

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Creighton*, vol. i. p. 236.

starting a new periodical on the highest intellectual level, a journey to America as representative, at the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Harvard University, of Emmanuel College, whence its founder had sprung, with all the hospitalities and oratory that such a visit imposed, and the publication of Volumes III. and IV. of the *History of the Papacy*—were all crowded into the brief space between the close of 1884 and the spring of 1890. How he played admirably so many parts is not so interesting to us as the revelation of the development of his inner life in the letters of this period.

‘Everybody [he writes] gains enormously in depth of thought by actual contact with the problems of the lives of others. Besides the knowledge which I gained at Embleton of the stern realities of the hard lives of common folk, I have felt a need for refreshing myself by some knowledge of the minds of the young. I have grudged time given to pupils and have taken them sadly; but I have always felt that they did much for me intellectually. They led me to see the forms in which ideas came to others; they taught me intellectual tolerance and breadth—lessons which I still only imperfectly have learned. Think of —, how quick were his intellectual sympathies; how readily he entered into others’ difficulties; how he divined the working of their minds. The quality which was at the root of his work was an intellectual large-heartedness. . . . I know that my own literary defect is the absence of these qualities. I regard it as a duty which lies at the bottom of all others to acquire them if I can. . . . No one knows until they have tried how a certain amount of practical, even of routine, work helps rather than hinders literary activity. Often a fruitful conception is suggested by some trivial problem which one has to solve. I learned much history at a board of guardians.’<sup>1</sup>

Side by side with this enunciation of the principles by which he strove to guide his own mental discipline and that of those who turned to him for help, may be placed an example of the crispness with which he could handle one of the most complicated of modern problems. The following are from a string of aphorisms on Biblical Criticism sent to Mr. J. H. Green. We do not quote them as indisputable, but as illustrations of his distinct grasp of the

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Creighton*, vol. i. pp. 272-3.

heart of the question, and the lucidity of his own method of resolving it.

'The object of Christian belief is the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ.

'The record of that Person has been transmitted by human agency.

'God's revelation was the Person.

'The nature of the record and the means of its formation is a worthy object of human research: much light has been thrown on it by criticism.

'But the less we make of the record, the more marvellous becomes the Person recorded.

'The establishment of an irrefutable explanation of the New Testament would not overthrow to a religious mind the doctrine of the Person of Christ.

'The miracles connected with that Person are analogous to the spiritual experience of the believing Christian.

'Therefore he is not moved by the presupposition that they are contrary to nature.

'The real question in dispute is the conception of *nature*.

'Biblical criticism will not solve that question.'<sup>1</sup>

The publication of the second and third volumes of the *History of the Papacy* brought a perplexing situation with Lord Acton, who had undertaken to notice them in the *English Historical Review*. In sending his paper Lord Acton stipulated that it should not appear until Hort or Gwatkin, or someone of equal counsel, had approved it, 'for you must understand it is the work of an enemy.' The ground of adverse criticism was 'the width of yawning difference' between Acton's view of history and Creighton's, as seen in the too lenient treatment by the latter of persecuting and immoral Popes, and Creighton was at once annoyed at the severity with which the reviewer expressed himself, and amused at his choice of the *Historical Review* as the vehicle for an onslaught on its editor. The real question at issue involved the principle by which men are to be judged:

'You,' wrote Acton, 'say that people in authority are not to be snubbed or sneered at from our pinnacle of conscious rectitude.

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Creighton*, vol. i. p. 331.



I really don't know whether you exempt them because of their rank or of their success and power, or of their date. . . . I cannot accept your canon, that we are to judge Pope and King unlike other men, with a favoured presumption that they did no wrong. If there is any presumption, it is the other way, against holders of power, increasing as the power increases. Historic responsibility has to make up for the want of legal responsibility. . . . The inflexible integrity of the moral code is to me the secret of the authority, the dignity, the utility of history.<sup>1</sup>

'I entirely agree with your principles of historical judgment,' was Creighton's reply, 'but apparently I admit casuistry to a greater extent than you approve,' and he went on to plead that anyone engaged in great affairs occupies a representative position which requires special consideration. When noticing these volumes we took exception to the author's too lenient treatment of great criminals, and we are not persuaded by his apology to alter our opinion.

The record of episcopal life in the second volume presents a truly bewildering variety of subjects both within and outside of legitimate episcopal administration. Space forbids us to deal as we should wish with his life at Peterborough, or to do more than glance at the subjects of first-rate importance crowded into the four years during which he was Bishop of London. They include the Queen's Jubilee, the Lambeth Conference, ritual difficulties embracing the points discussed at the Lambeth 'Hearing,' Diocesan Conferences, the Church Congress held for the first time in London, a Primary Charge which had necessarily to discuss with extreme caution all the grave and burning questions that are agitating the Church—all these added to the regulation of a diocese whose population increases at the rate of 40,000 annually, make up an appalling burden to be laid on one pair of shoulders. How wonderfully Creighton responded to the call—with what brilliancy and rapidity—is made transparently clear. 'He is too clever,' 'He tears the heart out of a question,' 'He spices life for all of us,' 'He sets us all thinking,' was the verdict of the most competent judges. But the tension must have been excessive even for the most versatile, and we regret that the

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Creighton*, vol. i. pp. 371, 372.

Bishop did not spare himself correspondence with officious nobodies—persons who might well have been relegated to his secretaries—and did not decline engagements which a bishop could scarcely be expected to accept.

The satisfactory treatment of ritualistic questions is the crux of episcopal administration, and Creighton endeavoured to grasp and be guided by definite principles in handling them. In determining his own attitude as a spiritual overseer, in deciding questions concerning the celebration or reservation of the Holy Eucharist, in defining the limits of legitimate diversity in doctrine or ceremonial, he was careful to think out the canons by which his course should be regulated; and both in formulating and enforcing them he was actuated by a spirit of the broadest toleration. His authority, he was firmly convinced, could only be exercised satisfactorily by moral persuasion and private exhortation, and legal prosecution would do more harm than good. In questions which had been discussed at the Lambeth 'Hearing' under the presidency of Archbishop Temple, he resolutely upheld the decisions then arrived at; but he did his utmost to make submission as easy as possible. With regard to the adoption of unauthorized services, he was shocked at the portentous childishness and inapplicability of some of the manuals of devotion employed, as well as by the fact that they were entirely at variance with the spirit of the English Church. In treating the matter before his diocesan conference he ended with this striking appeal:

'I do not wish to command so much as to persuade. I wish to induce people to see themselves as others see them, to regard what they are doing in reference to its far-off effects on the consciences of others, to cultivate a truer sense of the proportion of things, to deal more with ideas than with the clothing of ideas; to pay more attention to the reason of a thing than to its antiquity; to remember that the chief danger which besets those who are pursuing a high object is to confuse means with ends: to examine themselves very fully lest they confuse Christian zeal with the desire to have their own way, which is the characteristic of the natural man. I do not like to speak about myself. But we have reached a point where someone must be responsible for leading, and a leader must be

trusted. There is no leader possible save the Bishop. I ask you all, clergy and laity alike, to trust me and to follow me as far as you possibly can.'<sup>1</sup>

The mingled tact, sympathy, and firmness with which Creighton acted in this really perilous juncture, were crowned with signal success. Out of fifty-eight clergy in the diocese who had used incense or processional lights the great majority obeyed the Bishop's wishes; some protesting whilst they submitted, others distinctly refusing (whilst they yielded) to recognize the Primate's decision or to regard it as binding. Eighteen incumbents asked for an interview and agreed to suspend the use of incense during the celebration of the services. Only three men definitely refused after long interviews to come into line. The discussions even with the most recalcitrant had been perfectly friendly, but misrepresentations of them were circulated, and the Bishop complained of the difficulty of unofficial intercourse with his clergy. 'If I write a letter it is at once forwarded to the E.C.U. office and filed for everyone to see, and I am said to have "sanctioned" universally something which in a particular case I am prepared to overlook. If I have a friendly talk, it is at once misrepresented in any form from which most capital may be made.'

The London Church Congress in 1899 provided a unique opportunity for testing Creighton's manifold powers. The expediency of holding a Church Congress in the metropolis had been much canvassed. Party feeling was running high. The arena was held to be too large; the audience would be unmanageable. The preparations made were all on a gigantic scale, and every seat in the Albert Hall was filled to hear the Presidential address, which occupied an hour. The Bishop's subject was the work of the Church in the modern State, and concluded with an eloquent description of an ideal of the Church of England such as he deemed it possible to realize:—

'A Church fitted for free men, training them in knowledge and reverence alike; disentangling the spirit from the form, because of its close contact with sons who love their mother and frankly speak out their minds; not wandering among formulæ, however beautiful,

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Creighton*, vol. ii. p. 369.

which have lost their meaning ; finding room increasingly for every form of devotional life, but training its graces into close connection with men's endeavours and aspirations ; having no objects of its own which it cannot explain and make manifest as being for the highest good of all ; afraid of nothing, receptive of new impulses ; quick, watchful, alert ; proving all things and ever ready to give a reason for its principles and for their application ; exhorting, persuading, convincing ; so rooted in the past that it is strong in the present and evermore hopeful of the future. For the great work of the Church is to mould the future and so hasten the coming of the Kingdom. . . . Is this only a dream, to be realised—for realised assuredly it must—at some future time and under some other name ? Or shall we enter upon the possession which is really ours, did we but know it ? Our difficulties and differences arise because we have not a sufficiently lofty conception of the destiny of the English Church.' <sup>1</sup>

Creighton's personal share in the greatest of all Church Congresses was unremitting. He presided at all the Albert Hall meetings, generally summed up the discussions and preached at the Thanksgiving Service at St. Paul's at its close. His command over the huge and sometimes excited assembly was marvellous. 'I sat,' he wrote of it, 'in a chair for a week and made sixteen speeches. It was horrible !' The Congress was a success, and the President a revelation ; but the exhaustion, mental and bodily, must have been very great.

The last months of Creighton's episcopate were spent in earnest efforts to promote peace and a fuller understanding amongst the various schools of thought in the Church. With his own lofty conception of what the National Church might and ought to accomplish he mourned over its distraction by internal dissension, and he thought that if men of various opinions would meet for discussion, mutual sympathy and good-will would result. When the Round Table Conference met on his invitation at Fulham in October 1900 Creighton, who had suffered much pain at intervals for some months past, was too ill to do more than act as a genial host and occasional adviser, and during the next two months harassing episcopal anxieties about threatened ritual prose-

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Creighton*, vol. ii. pp. 395-6.

cutions must have aggravated the sickness which he bore with his usual cheerfulness, and which at one time bade fair to subside. Early in January, however, he had a relapse, and in a week all was over. From the 'appreciations' which Mrs. Creighton inserts in her closing pages we will confine ourselves to that written by the man who was best qualified in all England to speak—a keen judge of character, and by no means addicted to exuberant or unmeasured eulogy—the late Archbishop Temple. Those who knew the Primate will estimate its worth :

'His large and varied knowledge, his marvellous ability, his devotion to duty, must be missed by all of us incessantly. I shall miss him more than most other men will. His advice when I consulted him was always sound, and I know no instance in which I did not immediately follow it, and find afterwards that I had done right in following it. His perception of the real essence of every question that he had to determine or share in determining was instantaneous and never mistaken. Among the bishops of many generations there were very few that could be put by his side and he possessed that proof of crowning superiority, that he was still growing in both intellectual and practical power, and year after year was greater than he had been before.'<sup>1</sup>

The simultaneous loss of two prelates so eminent as Bishops Creighton and Stubbs inevitably suggests a comparison of their powers and characteristics. The task is not an easy one because of the singular inequality of the biographies before us, and because we have the more minute details of the less complex character. With certain important resemblances in their careers, few men perhaps amid similar conditions presented more distinct contrast or illustrated more vividly the diversity of gifts wherewith the 'One Spirit' dowers the Church. Both were pre-eminently Bishops of England as well as diocesans. Both had statesmanlike breadth of view and judicial sagacity in handling thorny questions. Both abhorred controversy and regarded it as more likely to foment partisanship than to further truth. Both brought to the discussion and solution of modern problems such intimate knowledge of the past as furnished them with

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Creighton*, vol. ii. p. 465.

principles for guidance in the present. Both firmly grasped as the clue to life the divine government of the world and strove to mould their action in obedience to what they believed to be the purpose of God. Both were imbued with a passionate devotion to the English Church, and a firm conviction of the lofty destiny which awaited it, if English Churchmen rose to the level of their high calling, and both had within them a living spring of sympathy which saw deep into the pathos of life. Both were singularly free from self-seeking and ambition. Both were somewhat sorrowfully conscious that most of those about them were quite incapable of understanding the full answer to the questions they were asking. Both were supremely influenced by an earnest personal piety which they were so careful not to obtrude that they were frequently misjudged or misinterpreted.

Let us turn to the contrasts between them. The outlook of Stubbs on life was essentially clerical and critical, that of Creighton was intrinsically lay and sanguine. The trend of the former was pessimistic—'The days are evil' was, as we noticed above, the text of his first University sermon; the bent of the latter inclined to optimism, and he held that if reforms were right and were honestly enforced, they would prevail in the end; if wrong, they would fail as they deserved. Stubbs was by conviction, temperament, and study the staunchest of Tories; 'Liberalism in religion,' says Mr. Hutton, 'in the sense in which the Tractarians announced it, was always for him anathema'<sup>1</sup>: Creighton had been trained in Liberal principles, and always desired to identify himself with the Liberal party; working hard to retain within its ranks men of moderate views and lamenting the prevailing tendency blindly to follow instead of leading public opinion. Stubbs abominated paradox as likely to mislead and confuse by obscuring truth; Creighton revelled in it as a means of elucidating truth and handled it with all the dexterity of a practised fencer who can use unbuttoned foils with perfect safety. Stubbs cordially disliked pomp and parade—the cost of keeping up Cuddesdon, the obligation of statutory lectures, the ordinary round of social festivities—even elabo-

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of Stubbs*, p. 126.

rate or protracted services tried him severely. Money, time, thought were too serious responsibilities to be expended on such secondary objects. Creighton indulged æsthetic tastes, entered into and thoroughly enjoyed the numberless functions, official and social, of London life ; found time to lecture, address, and correspond with all the world on every conceivable topic, and was to be seen magnificent in cope and mitre in Moscow or St. Paul's, or wherever else he was invited to appear in full pontificals. The motto of the former might have run, 'One thing I do' ; that of the latter, 'I became all things to all men that I might by all means save some.'

A certain stern self-repression, tempered by the genuine kindness of heart which lay beneath it and engendered probably by the hard struggles of his early life, threw into high relief Stubbs' caustic humour and controlled the intense emotional passion by which he was moved at times. He had strong prejudices which found vent occasionally in vehement expressions and in witty sarcasm. 'Everyone hath a doctrine, hath a psalm, and no patience.' He could not suffer fools gladly, and his scrupulous accuracy, and love of exactness, rendered him somewhat intolerant of lawyers, at whom he was constantly poking fun. Opinions he had once formed never admitted of material change, and however unpopular they might be he never shrank from expressing them. In his intense scorn for pretence he took a boyish delight in shocking people very harmlessly, and gave offence at times by his irrepressible appreciation of the comic side of things. His unerring learning, his critical acumen, his protracted study, his entire and laborious devotion to duty, his complete and conscious submission to the will of God throughout his early and later life, combined to sever him from all save a few choice spirits with whom alone he dared or cared to let himself go ; but for them his intimacy had no common charm. In many things he stood apart. 'A High Churchman on principle of the most uncompromising views, any approach to Ritualism was distasteful to him.' 'I won't be organized,' was his firm but good-natured answer, on one occasion. 'Do you suppose that I do not know as well as all thirty of them what to do?' He was not unfittingly described as a piece



of tough Yorkshire oak. Consciously reserved, he was yet mournfully sensible of the aloofness under which he had to bear heavy burdens of responsibility. If he failed to win the general affection of his diocese, if he worked too exclusively in his own way, if he were not 'the faultless monster that the world ne'er saw,' if he were not a great administrator, he had none the less the note of true distinction, and was a great historian and a great Churchman.

The mind of Creighton was cast in a very different mould. He was one of those favourites of nature to whom many of the prizes of life seem to come with but little effort. In the genial atmosphere of 'warm undergraduate friendship and university culture his intellectual development was rapid, and while his early marriage gave a valuable stimulus to energy, he was spared many of the anxieties by which character is strengthened and shaped. To his strenuous nature protracted study or exertion was not distressing, and he had his whole heart in work which he had thought out very clearly, and was allowed to follow with exceptional freedom from serious hindrance. The most salient features of his character were his independence of mind, his transparent simplicity, his abounding sympathy, his rapid seizure of the kernel of any subject which came before him, and his many-sidedness and versatility. His wide stores of knowledge were at the command of anyone, however young and simple, to whom they could be of service, and he deemed no trouble too great to guide the perplexed or to comfort the sorrowing. From his innumerable letters we might quote extracts dealing with an extraordinary variety of questions, all marked by singular clearness of thought, and going straight to the mark. His facility of expression and his felicity in definition were marvellous, and they flashed out frequently when, whilst writing his letters at some committee meeting, and apparently regardless of what was going on, he suggested the exact phrase to express the conclusion arrived at, or proposed a compromise on which opposite opinions could concur.

Of course he had the defects of his qualities. His desire, as an historian, to place himself in the position of the men

he was describing led him to appreciate their difficulties so keenly that he was too tolerant in his judgements, and brought down on himself the wrath of Lord Acton. In his love of paradox he sometimes shocked his hearers, and sometimes verged dangerously near to bathos. In his episcopal activities he was too sporadic, and, to the regret of genuine admirers, did not concentrate all his energy on the more immediate work, itself too exhausting for one man, of the spiritual oversight of the enormous diocese of London. Was the facility with which he worked, and his power of rapid production, which enabled him to preach after brief preparation in the train, or with no preparation at all, possibly a disadvantage? If the expression of his thought had called for more pains, would he have produced something finer, deeper, more spiritual? He was brilliant, commanding, fascinating, and with all his limitations he towered above most of his contemporaries, and must rank amongst the foremost prelates of the nineteenth century. And we may sum up our article by saying that whilst no two men could seem more dissimilar than the brilliant epigrammatist and the profound historian, they were both idealists and men of deep and earnest convictions. Creighton was essentially the high product of his age, the flower of the religious and intellectual culture of the Victorian era in its manifold and complex development. Beneath the statesmanship and learning, the reserve and loneliness of Stubbs there lay, according to the unanimous testimony of those who knew him best, a vein of that inner piety, laborious, patient, and self-sacrificing, which is the touchstone of saintliness in all ages, and which when all hearts are tried will be found to have earned the highest reward.

---

## ART. VII.—HEINRICH SUSO, THE MYSTIC.

*Heinrich Suso's Leben und Schriften, nach den ältesten Handschriften und Drucken mit unveränderten Texte in neuerer Schriftsprache herausgegeben von MELCHIOR DIEPENBROCK. Vierte Auflage. (Regensburg: G. J. Manz, 1884.)*

It is needless to emphasize the important part taken by Mysticism in the history of human thought. For philosopher, psychologist, poet, theologian, humanist, and 'plain Christian' it has possessed supreme attraction at all times, and not least at the present day. For it is to the mystics who, like their Lord, seem to speak with authority and not as the scribes, that the attention of many who are angered, wearied, bewildered, has turned, in fascination or in hope, from the misunderstandings and dim uncertainties of scientific, critical, and religious controversy. In fascination—for the history of these souls, who sought and who found, rouses in all who are conscious of struggle an envious wonder: in hope—for there are those who find in Christian mysticism not only peace for the individual soul, but the principle of union for divided Christendom. The matter, however, is a high one, and the dangers connected with it neither few nor small, and study, honest and critical, if humble, must be given to it if it is not to prove one more *ignis fatuus*.

The works of Heinrich Suso, one of the best known of the mediæval mystics, provide materials for such study. They illustrate many sides of mystical experience, some alien to us, and some which are reviving in a strange resurrection in the most modern of all modern thought. Happily, in the autobiography, his account of himself is so clear and full that it is easy to gain a clear conception of his character and teaching.

Heinrich von Berg, or Suso, as he preferred to be called after his beloved mother, was born about the year 1300 of a noble Swabian family and died in a Dominican monastery at Ulm about 1365. Of his early childhood we know but little that

is definite, as his autobiography, recounted at her request to one of his spiritual daughters and by her preserved, is not concerned with his first years, but we are told enough to shew that his home could not have been very happy.

His father he describes as 'in this life a child of the world'; and his mother, who was 'a holy woman,' suffered greatly from her husband's waywardness. 'She was full of God, and would fain have lived in a godly manner; but he was full of the world, and fought strongly against her godliness, and thereby came to her much suffering.' At the hour of her death she appeared to her son, then at school at Cologne, and, bidding him love God, assured him that though gone from this world she was not dead; and 'she kissed him with her mother's love upon the mouth, and blessed him, and so vanished.'

The boy entered the novitiate of the Dominican monastery at Constance at the age of thirteen, and seems to have passed the next five years in the ordinary school routine. That he was always a devout boy is clear from his reference to five spiritual visions which came to him before his 'conversion'; but he dates his spiritual life from his eighteenth year. It was about this time that there came a fresh awakening of his soul, his final separation from everything which could be called worldly, and that complete dedication of himself to the Eternal Wisdom which was to be henceforth the mainspring of his life; and it is here that the autobiography begins.

The story opens with his early struggles as a beginner in the spiritual life. We learn that his final conversion was not brought about by any special event or human influence; it was the direct work of God in his soul. He found only dissatisfaction in the things that had most pleased him, and so he sought for 'some other thing which should bring peace to his wild heart.' But it was only the kind God Who could free him from this 'gnawing at his heart,' and though when the change came his comrades, wondering, tried to account for it, one saying this, another that, the boy himself knew that it was the work of no person, but 'the hidden, enlightening drawing of God' which 'worked speedily in him this turning away from things.' 'Things,' 'creatures,' is Suso's

term for the worldly matters which distract the soul from God.

But the struggle was not over. The enemy whispers that it is easy to begin, but it is hard to bring to fulfilment; and when the Inner Voice brings to mind God's Power to help, answers that as to God's Power there is no doubt, but how if He wills not to help? But this is to the Servant or Servitor (as the narrator calls himself) a sure matter, for God has made it sure with His good promise. And when grace had won the day for him in this strife, then came the enemy in the form of a friend and counselled: 'Be not unmeasured in goodness; eat and drink that others be not vexed, nor talk of thee; if thy heart be right, all is right; other men wish also to go to heaven who live not so strict a life.' So the familiar struggle went on, but at last however 'the Servant won courage' to turn himself, as he says, 'wholly from things.'

Then came the bitter trial of loneliness. His pining for love sent him to his friends for some 'lightening of his spirit'; yet it commonly happened that he went to them cheerfully but came from them sad. So he had to live, wretched and without love; but in no long time this constraint of spirit won for him his first rapture. On Saint Agnes' Day he went into the choir of the chapel, 'strangely pressed by heavy suffering,' and there, his soul rapt, whether in the body or out of the body, he saw and heard that which no tongue can tell.

'It was without form and fashion, yet had in itself the joyful pleasure of all forms and fashions; his heart was eager and yet satisfied, every wish was stilled, and every desire gone.' Afterwards came the pain of the body, the groaning and sinking to the earth; but still 'the powers of his soul were filled with the sweet taste of heaven, as when one shakes a good electuarium out of a box and the box keeps still the goodly scent thereof.'

Visionary mysticism may seem to many remote and unreal. In Suso's case it is helpful to remember that his is specially the artist's temperament. It is always in images that he can best express his thoughts and emotions, and he delights in pouring forth rich and glowing descriptions of these

images and pictures of the mind ; perhaps here, therefore, we find the truest explanation of some at any rate of his visions. At first he seems to be aware that he is deliberately framing to himself a mental image by which to set forth some remote beauty of truth or some otherwise inexpressible emotion ; but, later, this conscious exercise of his own will in the matter seems to be forgotten, and he regards the visions as the work of some other power affecting him from the outside. As to the essence of things, the difference seems after all to be but slight. It is the same difference, a difference of form, which distinguishes the deliberate mental realization by an ordinary person of angelic beings from a poetic description of their Dance and Song in heavenly places, such as Suso gives in words and Fra Angelico in colour and line—the poet and artist merely give concreteness to the harmony, calmness, devotion, happiness, which are the abstract terms in which we present the angelic state to our intellect. It is in this way that Suso describes an appearance to him of his guardian angel. Surely, as to the truth of such a vision, it matters little, whether, if closely questioned, he would have declared that his guardian angel actually as a fact of experience appeared to him, or whether he is merely describing the form which to his poetic imagination and devout faith such a visitation might take.

Or again : he has so thought over and dwelt upon the kindness and beauty of the Holy Mary, that all hope of kindness and joy of beauty is clothed for him with her form. It is easy to understand his growing certainty that such a one would desire to come to him for his comfort and enlightenment, his own passionate desire for such a coming, and also the more or less unconscious exercise of will in the matter on his own part. And at length his own imagination of such a coming would seem to be not the work of his own brain but an effect of condescending love on her part.

But, account as we will for these things, we cannot but acknowledge the difference between a sceptic's description of what an angel might be, and Suso's description of what an angel is—and we do not hesitate to ascribe that difference to the faith of the saint. It is the same difference which we feel

to exist between Milton's Satan and the 'Enemy' of the Bible. Those who question whether there be angel or spirit can hardly hope even to imagine, far less to see, the glories of Heaven opened ; and no broodings of poetic imagination by itself on the life of a Jewish peasant-girl will avail to shew to any of us Mary the Mother of God.

Hence it is that visions technically so called, like 'miracles,' do not constitute proof of the presence of the Unseen except to the individuals immediately concerned. To others they must be fact or dream or folly, as each finds it possible to conceive of them. Suso's great description of his visions of the Eternal Wisdom is perhaps an example of the first step in such mental experience—the vision of the poet rather than the visionary. We give some account of it as such, and also as shewing the fervour of the author's feeling and the beauty of his language.

It was the custom in religious houses that the Sacred Scriptures should be read aloud at meal-times ; and Suso felt his heart fired by the descriptions which he heard of the Eternal Wisdom, of that wisdom 'who gives to her lover youth and virtue, dignity and riches, honour and profit, great power and an everlasting name, who makes him loving and teaches him high ways of courtesy, wins him praise from the peoples and fame from the multitudes, and gets him high favour with God and man.' Listening to such praises of Heavenly Wisdom, the thought came to him that he too should make trial of his fortune whether perchance this high mistress of whom he heard such great wonders would be indeed beloved by him. At first doubts and hesitations beset him. 'Shall I love that which I have never seen, that of which I know not what it is?' If he shrinks from the hardships which such desires seem to bring upon the devout lover, his thought is met only by Wisdom's own unanswerable decree, 'to Love belongs suffering, of ancient right.'

But at last he gave himself to Wisdom in spiritual espousals, and he describes his heavenly bride in a burst of poetry, as she appeared to him in vision. 'She floated high above him in a choir of clouds ; she was light as the morning star, was glittering like the rising sun ; her crown was



eternity, her raiment blessedness, her word sweetness, her embrace the fulness of every delight ; she was far and near ; high and low ; she was at hand, yet hidden ; one might go in her company, yet might no man reach her. She stretches higher than the highest heavens, and touches the deepest places of the abyss : she spreads herself from end to end mightily, and orders all things sweetly. Just as he thought to have in her a fair maiden, forthwith he found a noble youth. She bore herself now as a wise teacher, and now as a brave lover. She came near to him lovingly, and greeted him right friendly, and said to him sweetly, 'Give me thy heart, my child !' With utmost devotion does the Servant respond : 'Ah my heart, behold, whence flows love and all bliss ? Whence comes all tenderness, fairness, joy of heart and loveliness ? Comes it not all from the outflowing source of the pure Godhead ? Up, up, then, heart and sense and mind, up then, into the unfathomed abyss of all lovely things ! Who shall keep me back now ? Ah, now I embrace thee with the desire of my burning heart !' And so it became his use when he heard sung a song of praise, or sweet music sounding, or heard men sing or tell of earthly love, swiftly to turn his heart and mind inwardly to gaze solely upon his loveliest love, from whom flows all love. How often he embraced that lovely form in the deep of his yearning heart, and pressed it lovingly, is not to be told. It happened to him often, he tells us, as when a mother has her sucking child pressed in her arms lying on her bosom ; as it lifts itself with its head and movement of its body towards its tender mother, and by its lovely bearing shews forth its joy of heart, so often did his heart within his body, turning towards the presence so rich in pleasure of the Eternal Wisdom, overflow with tenderness. Then thought he, 'Ah Lord ! how would my soul rejoice if only a queen were my spouse ! Ah, now art thou the empress of my heart, thou bestower of every grace ! In thee have I riches enough, as much as I will—of all that is in earth I desire no more.'

One of the most beautiful visions in the book is granted in preparation for a great sorrow. He thought he was going to sing Mass in a certain place, and the singers prepared for

him the Mass of the Martyrs—*Multae tribulationes iustorum*. 'Fain would he have turned to another Mass, and said, "Why sing to-day the Mass of the Martyrs? It is not a martyr's day." The singers looked at him, and pointed to him and said, "God finds His martyrs to-day, as He has ever found them. Make ready thyself, and sing for thyself." He flung the leaves of the Mass-book which lay before him to and fro, and would rather have sung of penitents or anything else, than of the suffering martyrs—but however he turned it was all full of the Martyrs.'

Another vision shews us Suso's philosophic mind beginning to question about the deepest matters of the Faith. Later in his life he wrote much about things here presented with that crudeness which has yet so strange a quality of beauty. He saw a vision of spirits, and he besought one of the bright princes of heaven to shew him 'how God dwells in the soul.' He was bidden to look into himself, and he saw as through a crystal 'in the midst of his heart the Eternal Wisdom in lovely form,' and beside her his own soul 'leaning lovingly to God's side and embraced in His arms and pressed to His Divine Heart, and lying entranced and drowned in the arms of the God he loved.' Visions came sometimes as a refreshment after he had been 'chastising his body,' as when he saw the heavenly dance of the angels—a dance like no earthly dance, 'but a heavenly movement upwards and again backwards in the wild abyss of the Divine hiddenness,' while the angels chanted 'a joyful little song of the little Child Jesus which says thus: "*In dulci jubilo*."'

Many of these visions, it seems clear, have much in common with the imaginations of the poet. But there are others more concrete and less explicable. His guardian angel talks to him; and souls in purgatory appeared, with whom he speaks, amongst others 'blessed Meister Eckhardt and holy Brother John der Tucrer of Strasburg.' He saw also the souls of his father—who first shewed him the anguish of his purgatory, and how his son could help him, and later appeared again to tell him that by his help he was free—and of his holy mother, and many others.

But Suso is not only a visionary mystic; he carried out

the practice of devotional mysticism to the full, in many details which shew him to be of spirit sometimes almost playful, sometimes almost fierce. He tells of his going to table, when he would kneel down before the Eternal Wisdom and beseech Him very earnestly to go with him to table and eat with him; and then he would place 'this beloved guest of pure souls' beside him at the table and 'bend towards Him often on the side of His heart.' Each plate was offered for blessing; each draught was in memory of the Lord's wounds; and the food which he did not like he 'dipped in the wounded heart of his Beloved.' Fruit presented temptation to him, and for two years he abstained from it, but at last—and we notice here the humility and common-sense which the experience of the Church has taught us must be exercised in such details—'wishing to be no longer singular,' he took to it again, and in a time of fruit famine prayed that the convent might be supplied. His prayer was answered, an unknown friend bringing next day a supply of new pennies with the desire that 'fresh apples' might be provided for the monks.

The festivals of the world Suso translated into the spiritual region. He kept New Year's Day or Carnival or May-Day in a spiritual fashion of his own, by bringing garlands of devotion and rapture to his Heavenly Lover, or singing May songs in honour of the Holy Cross; and his Carnival was a 'foretaste of eternity,' for sometimes 'God already, in this mortal body, makes merry with His friends.'

He loves to weave all creation into the web of his spiritual joy. His love and embraces and genuflexions, spiritual garlands of devotion for the Cross, the Heavenly May-Tree, are symbolized by 'all red roses, all little violets, all tender lilies, all fair-coloured and glowing flowers, all the adornings with which ever a May-time was adorned.' And in his exposition of the '*Sursum Corda*' there is a fine example of this idea of the sympathy of nature. 'Shining thoughts,' he says, came to him as he sang the words at Mass.

'I set before the eyes of my soul myself, all that I am, with body, soul, and all my powers, and set around me all creatures which God

ever created in heaven, in earth, and in all the elements, each with its name, were it birds of the air, beasts of the forest, fish of the waters, leaf and grass of the earth, and all the unnumbered sand of the sea, and therewith all the little motes which shine in the sunbeam, and all the little drops of water, of dew and snow and rain which ever fall or have fallen, and wished that each of them had a sweet instrument of music made ready out of my heart's innermost chords, and thus forthsounding from first to last should bring to the beloved tender God new and glorious praise.'

But our admiration of his power of simple happiness is changed into a sort of indignant anger, only however to be silenced by wonder at his devotion, when we read of the austerities which Suso practised. We pass gladly over the details; but for eighteen years this gentle dreamer tortured himself with hunger and thirst, nails and scourgings, watching and solitude. He wore a hair shirt so long that he was tormented with vermin; for a considerable time he had a cross with nails in it on his back under his habit; his bed was an old door, with a little reed mat reaching only as far as the knees for mattress, a sack of straw and a very small pillow at his head, and a heavy cloak by way of blanket. He had usually one meal a day, abstaining even then not only from flesh meat, but from fish and eggs, and he drank so little that his mouth became sore like that of a fever patient. At certain seasons he scourged himself with a leather discipline weighted with nails, and he would stand for hours on the bare stones of the chapel, his feet swollen with the cold. It is heartrending to read of his body covered with festering sores, of his broken restless nights, of his agonies of thirst; and all this he endured, though perhaps with varying intensity, not for a few weeks, but for something like twenty years. At last, as he says, 'nothing remained for him but to die or to cease therefrom'; and at the age of forty 'God made him sure that the time was come when he might be released from these sufferings.' It was with tears of joy that he resumed the more normal discipline of the monastic life.

He gives two reasons for his submission to this excruciating self-inflicted pain, which, we must remember, is far

from being an essential of the mystical life. He desired to conquer what he calls 'the lively nature of his youth,' but his chief motive seems to have been the great love he felt to God the Eternal Wisdom, our Lord Jesus Christ, Whose sufferings he would fain imitate. This passionate devotion to a Master, a devotion which will not be denied a share even in His bodily suffering, is distinctively characteristic of mediæval asceticism. The Indian fakir despises his body as evil, and ill-treats it accordingly—the mediæval monk sees his Master on a cross, and from thenceforth luxury and comfort are a shame to him. His body may be, certainly is, an avenue of temptation, and as such must be disciplined, controlled, hated; but it is also a means by which he can partake in the agony of the Lord he loves, and be wounded with His very wounds. It is thus at any rate that Suso chose his way of suffering, not as the outcome of any philosophy of pain, but as the instinct of a child's love. We gladly note, however, that he would not allow his spiritual daughters to practise mortification without due regard to their age and sex, and also that he kept his sufferings secret so far as possible.

Mysticism, however, consists neither of passive suffering nor of rapture; there is growth in it. It is not a system, nor a school of thought; it is a life. So much we can learn from the study of Suso's spiritual history, for there is clearly change in it, development, expansion. And first with regard to suffering. It is revealed to him that so far it is only in 'the lower school' that he has been practising, and he is bidden to learn diligently 'the highest knowledge.' For example, hitherto he has endured only what he has laid upon himself, prompted by his own reason.

'Thou art still [he says to himself], like a frightened hare, lying hidden in a bush, afraid of every flying leaf; accidental pain thou hast feared all thy life. At the glance of thy gainsayer thou turnest pale; when thou shouldst endure thou dost flee; when thou shouldst offer thyself wholly thou hidest thyself; if men praise thee thou dost laugh, if they blame thee thou art sad; it is verily true that thou hast need of higher schooling!'

His soul responds to this reproach in the cry, 'Oh, when shall I have wholly forsaken self?'

And so, in vision, from being a servant, he sees himself knighted in God's service, and is promised 'fighting enough.' God had indeed removed his former yoke, but only to change it for another, and that of heavier weight. Hitherto he has had power over himself at any rate; now he is to be taken from himself, and handled by strangers; his honour will be lost, 'he will be struck down into nothing.' Hitherto he has profited by the affectionate nature which God had given him; but now his friendliness is to meet with faithlessness and unkindness, and all his companions will turn their backs on him. Hitherto he has been kept in Divine sweetness 'like a fish in the sea'; now that also is to cease, so that he will be forsaken both by God and the world.

How this suffering is to be met is also revealed.

'When thou art in pain, look not forward to the ending of that pain, but whilst thou art still enduring it make ready patiently to receive the next; as a maiden who, when plucking her roses, looks about, whilst plucking one, towards those she will take next.'

He tried to shut himself more closely than ever into his cell, so that, being cut off from all the world, he might attend more diligently to his own life; but he could not shut out trouble. He was tormented by evil spirits; and more terrible still for such a man were the inner sufferings which beset his mind. Questions as to the Faith distressed him, so that he sought for help 'with crying heart and weeping eyes' during nine long years, before he could find the light he needed. Inordinate sadness weighed 'like a mountain on his heart,' and a scrupulous anxiety as to the circumstances of his reception into his Order made him miserable for years. It appears that 'certain worldly goods' were given to his monastery when he went into it, and, fearing that this was the sin of simony, he thought his own soul would never attain salvation. For these scruples and fears he sought the counsel of Eckhardt, by whom he was comforted and 'set free from the hell which he had so long endured.'

And then came new teaching. He must no longer care

only for his own soul, he must care also for his neighbour. The cell is to be forsaken for public life, and private sorrows are to be forgotten in the sorrows of others. So he began to work ; and from this time, monk, visionary, ascetic as he was, 'housed in a dream, at distance from the kind,' he certainly was not. His life is taken up with journeys and letters, interviews and sermons ; as we read, we learn once more that it is impossible to accuse mystics of being necessarily impractical. The troubles of a public character beset Suso on all hands. There are false accusations of heresy, of pretending to work miracles for money, of stealing wax from a shrine, of being a poisoner—for it was the time of the Black Death, and unpopular people were suspected of being its cause. His sermons and books attracted attention, and though many were drawn to put themselves under his direction, the violent antagonism also aroused witnesses incidentally to the thoroughness and energy with which he worked. Certain nobles, we find, even threatened his life because he had drawn members of their family into that 'special kind of life which is called Spirit.' He did not shrink from rebuking open sinners, and for this he had to pay a heavy price. One of them brought very bitter trouble upon him by her scandalous tongue, and Suso had to endure the forsaking of friends, and the triumph, for a while, of false accusers. He was at length exonerated, but the cost to himself was, he tells us, unspeakable.

It is true that the suspicion of not being a good man of business did cling to him, in spite of his activity : the anxiety of the brethren in his monastery when he was elected Prior is rather amusing. Food had failed for the monks, and when the new Prior in Chapter bade them pray to St. Dominic for help, one of the brothers began to scoff at him for a fool ; and another answered 'He is not the only fool ; we are all fools for having taken him for our Prior, when we knew well enough that he is unskilful in worldly things and only always gazing towards heaven.' It is pleasant to read that a rich friend came to the Prior's assistance, and from that time, during his tenure of office, the monastery lacked nothing.

For Suso was never altogether without sympathetic friends.



Mention is made incidentally of several ; Eckhardt helped him with spiritual counsel on at least one occasion, and the many souls to whom he himself had brought comfort were able, at any rate sometimes, to be of use to their benefactor. Of these the chief is his spiritual daughter Elizabeth Staglin, a nun of his own Order, to whom we owe the biography and the collection of letters. He says that 'she was of very holy demeanour outwardly, and inwardly of angelic mind.' Until the long illness which preceded her death had incapacitated her, she was of service to him with his books, being able in her devotion and saintliness to understand and appreciate his teaching ; and many of his expositions of high mysteries were written in answer to her questionings.

Above a dozen of Suso's letters to his spiritual children have been preserved. The subjects treated of are common enough : to one he writes as to the bearing of office, to another on preparation for death, another he warns of her danger from instability of nature, and so on. All are full of tenderness and affection ; not in vain had been the writer's desire to 'love whom God loves.' And beyond this, the touching story of Suso's rescue of his sister proves that mysticism, even ascetic mysticism, does not necessarily quench the fire of natural affection, but may even inflame it. This sister was a nun who fell into mortal sin, and left her convent, no one knowing her whereabouts. When they told her brother, he became 'like a stone for sorrow, and his heart died' ; but soon he cried to himself, 'See if thou canst help that poor lost soul ; offer to-day all worldly honour to the gentle God, cast away all human shame, spring after her into the deep pit and lift her out.' His friends turned from him, and refused help, so he set out alone on his search, going wherever he could find any traces of her. And at last, on St. Agnes' Eve, being half dead from a fall into a flooded brook, he was directed to a certain small house, whither he went with sad steps, and there he found her. When he saw her he fell fainting and powerless on the bench at her side, and then clasping her in his arms he said, 'Alas, my child, alas, my sister, what have I endured for thee ! Alas ! gentle St. Agnes, how bitter has thy day become for me !' And

again he fainted. 'Then his sister arose and fell at his feet with great bitter tears, and said mournfully, "Ah, Lord and Father, what a sad day was that which brought me into the world, that I have lost God and have given to thee such pain!"' Together they mourned and suffered; but at last he had the joy of seeing the lost sheep, whom 'with unutterable shame and great weariness he had brought back in his arms to the kind God,' restored to a happier state.

We have further evidence of his appreciation of this mystical lovingkindness in the *Dialogue of Truth*, where he gives advice as to the practice of external religion and the duties of ordinary life which is quite Pauline in its vigour, and shews that everyday goodness, far from being incompatible with heights of mystical thought, is its natural fruit. How, he asks, does a truly devout (*gelassen*, detached) man behave towards his neighbours? The answer does not seem to fall short of the old ideal of ordered Christian love. 'He lives in fellowship with others without vanity, he loves them without being possessed by them, he pities them without anxiety; in all things he keeps a right freedom.' His maxim, 'Live as if there were no creature in the world but thyself,' must be read in the light of his own life of active benevolence; it surely refers to that freedom from 'things' which is certainly one of his ideals.

And this brings us to Suso's conception of the inner life, of the soul's relationship to God, and to his teaching in philosophy. In these matters his master is Eckhardt. This great thinker, a Provincial of Suso's own Order, the Friars Preachers, must have exercised one of the most formative influences on him in early life. He was at the full height of his power in Germany when Suso reached manhood, and we may well believe that the famous teacher had no more eager pupil. Eckhardt, besides being an original thinker of a high order, was a man 'learned with all the learning of his age,' who had, as he says of himself, 'read many writings both of the heathen masters and the prophets and the Old and New Testament, and had with earnestness and full diligence sought out what is the best and highest virtue,' and doubtless through him Suso became acquainted with the authors who were after-

wards his own favourite masters, Aristotle, Dionysius and 'dear St. Thomas.' Though Eckhardt was Suso's senior by about forty years, the tie between them was close; it was to him that Suso turned in a time of great mental trouble, and though he does not refer to him directly more than two or three times in his writings, it is always in terms of deep veneration. The two men must, however, have been very different in temperament. Eckhardt is primarily intellectual; Suso can think and reason also, but he will interrupt a deep argument about the Being of God to burst into a passionate rapture of adoration, as though to his clear spirit the reasonings and discussions so dear to his master were trammels rather than aids. The difference is well illustrated in the literary style of their respective works; Suso's peculiar glory of poetic language has little in common with Eckhardt's steady, well-knit prose.

Suso's philosophy may be briefly summed up. Man's highest blessedness is the knowledge of God, and 'to some knowledge of God, by hard seeking, a diligent man can attain.' Thus, he says, taught Aristotle the wise, who 'sought in Nature for the Lord of Nature and found Him.' Who is God? All who tell of truth teach that there is something which is everywhere the First; it is One, it is Being unmixed with Not-Being. It is nameless, because all that we can say of it is limited, and therefore in a manner false. And hence Dionysius calls it the Not-Being and the No-thing, not that it is No-thing, but from the surpassingness of its Being. But since nothing can be thought of without a name, we may call it Being; bodiless essential Spirit, whose Being is His life and work. Mortal eyes cannot see Him, and the human mind is blinded in that Divine Darkness, itself the clearest of all light. It is a living Reason, which understands Itself, and lives in Itself and is One. 'This I call the eternal uncreated Truth. There all things are in their source and eternal beginning. And there a devout man has his beginning, and there also his end.'

This essential Unity can be known only in His Act (*Gethat*). The Nature and Being of Godhead flows forth in the eternal life and love of the Holy Trinity. A distinction is

drawn between 'Godhead' and 'God'; it is 'God,' not 'God-head,' who as the Father begets the Son. Yet essentially 'Godhead' and 'God' are one; the distinction he seems almost to regard as a concession to the limits of human thought. The Father utters Himself in the Son; the Holy Spirit is the mutual pouring forth of the love of the Father and of the Son. Christ is the Son of God by Nature, and thus differs essentially from holy men, who are sons of God by Grace.

The world of things exists as a pattern, or thought, in God, and so far it is one with God. But each thing has also life in its own form, distinct from the Divine Life, and from all other life. Thus the stone is not God, nor is God the stone. This special life, flowing from God, is higher than the existence in God only; it is nobler and more useful; for, coming forth from God, creation is no longer 'God in God,' but can reflect Him, and turn itself back again to Him. Evil arises when a reasonable creature refuses thus to turn back towards the One, but wills to remain separate.

To lose himself in the One is man's highest bliss; it is to be with Christ where He is. It is to be attained by the forsaking of self: the five selves—being, growth, consciousness, human nature, individuality—which belong to each person. This losing of self is compared to the unconsciousness of a drunken man, or to the spilling of one drop of water in much wine. The 'manifold pressure of the body' forbids its full attainment in this world; yet are there some few of the most devout so transformed into the Oneness of the First Pattern that they arrive, it may be, at a full forgetfulness of this life; so that 'his body is on earth, but the man is in eternity.' In this nothingness which is its goal, the holy soul, though always it remains a creature, so loses itself as to have no consciousness of being or of not being. There also the freedom of the will is lost, yet there first does it become free, when it wills to cease from willing, and life and will and work become a still, unmoved freedom. And—for Suso is no Pantheist, nor is his God a 'stream of tendency'—though lost in this living, nameless, nothingness the soul knows well that it is being held by Another, one with, yet other than, itself.

Such is Suso's philosophy, and in a treatise called *The Little Book of the Nine Rocks*—almost certainly written by him and published with his other works—we have a description of the ideal character which should be its practical result. The truly devout are those

'who desire nothing except to be conformed to the image of Christ. . . . They have so given themselves up to God that what He does with them and with all things, that pleases them wholly. Does He give them aught, they say it is well ; does He take aught from them, they say it is well ; and so in all things they are free. . . . They have no fear, neither of hell, nor purgatory, nor of the enemy, nor of death, nor of life ; all fear is fallen away from them, only lest they do not imitate the image of Christ as they would fain do. . . . They love all men in God, and whom God loves, him do they also love. They are wholly dead to the world, and all natural works, which they ever practised by themselves, by their own natures, are dead. . . . These men are the true worshippers, for they worship the Father in spirit and in truth.'

An edition of Eckhardt's sermons has lately appeared—a labour of love, as the editor assures us—containing only that part of his teaching which 'speaks to us' and which is original. Accordingly, all that he taught which is in common with what is technically 'scholastic theology' is so far as possible relegated to the dust-heap ; it is regarded only as the *milieu* of Eckhardt's own thought, which is practically independent of it. Clearly, we are told, so great a thinker could not owe anything to philosophical conceptions connected with a religion founded on 'myths' and 'anecdotes.' They are merely the mental environment in which he found himself, the terms in which he, in common with his generation, could best express himself.

That one may select favourite passages from an author's works and present them to the public as such is of course permissible ; it is also permissible to point out what part of a man's writings are due to independent thought. But to suggest that this is the whole of his teaching, and to neglect much which, though the work of others, he certainly endorses, seems to be as unfair as it is unscientific. With Eckhardt we are not at this moment concerned ; but were we

to treat Suso—one of his chief followers—in such a way, the portrait we should leave with our readers would be almost a caricature. The *Dialogue of Truth* is a philosophical treatise expounding a distinctly Christian philosophy, and owing much to scholastic thought; it would be quite unintelligible and useless to anyone who rejects the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and of individual immortality. The *Book of the Eternal Wisdom*, which, though written earlier, was included by the author in the authoritative collection of his writings published towards the end of his life, is composed of meditations on the Passion, on Heaven and Hell, and the glories of Mary; it would equally be unintelligible to those who do not accept the doctrines of the Incarnation and Atonement. To suppose that his faith as a Christian, as a Catholic, was not the centre, the kernel, the meaning of his life, is, to those who know his writings, ludicrous. Suso, the mystical philosopher, is not the forerunner of modern agnosticism: he is a Christian in line with apostles, confessors, and martyrs.

Suso's writings may certainly be neither suitable for, nor attractive to, all readers, but their value to students of mysticism is clear, as exemplifying both its dangers and its beauty. Exaggeration, childishness, a voluptuousness of expression from which we shrink, the horrors of an asceticism which we feel to be based on grievous error, the touch of hysterical excitement which is so sad an element in much religious writing, may all be found in them. Some minds, however, may think it worth while to endure all these blemishes and defects for the sake of the simplemindedness, the courage and devotion visible beneath them, for the bright poetry of the writer's happier moments, for the wisdom of much of his advice in spiritual matters, and for the evidence they afford of the power of our holy religion.

---

## ART. VIII.—WEISMANN AND THE THEORY OF DESCENT.

1. *Vorträge über Descendenztheorie.* Von AUGUST WEISMANN. Zweite Auflage. (Jena, 1904.)
2. *The Evolution Theory.* By Dr. AUGUST WEISMANN. Translated by J. ARTHUR THOMSON, Regius Professor of Natural History in the University of Aberdeen, and MARGARET R. THOMSON. (London: Edward Arnold, 1904.)

AMONG the older workers in the field of evolutionary theory, few names are better known than that of August Weismann, the veteran Professor of Zoology in the University of Freiburg-in-Breisgau. For the greater part of a long life he has devoted himself to carrying on the campaign opened by Darwin and Wallace nearly fifty years ago. But his claim to high place among the leaders of biological thought does not rest mainly on his achievements as a champion of the views of others; it depends rather upon the additions which he has himself made to the evolutionary fabric, upon the suggestive and stimulating quality of his speculative writings, and perhaps in greatest measure of all upon the determined and, as many think, successful onslaught that he has conducted on the body of opinion which, under the somewhat vague heading of Lamarckism, had been allowed to dominate evolutionary thought, even to the extent of securing the partial adherence of Darwin. It is chiefly on this last account that Weismann is looked upon to-day as the maker of an epoch in the history of biological inquiry.

When a thinker of power and originality gives to the world his matured conclusions on a series of problems with which his training and natural inclination have well fitted him to deal, and on which he is known to have bestowed prolonged attention, it is only to be expected that his pronouncement should be received with exceptional interest. In the volume whose title is printed at the head of the present article we have a case of this description. It is true



that so daring an innovator as Weismann has shewn himself to be in many departments of the subject is certain to rouse much opposition ; and as a matter of fact the thoroughgoing adherents of his views in their entirety are remarkably few, both in his own country and elsewhere. There are, however, many scientific authorities of the first rank who are able to give a partial assent to his conclusions ; and all investigators whose pursuits have lain in the same direction, whether scientifically friends or foes, cannot but unite in admiration for his ability, industry, and evident love of truth. There are therefore ample reasons for the sympathetic interest with which this monumental summary of Weismann's life-work has been regarded—a feeling heightened by the knowledge that the indefatigable author is now threatened with an eye-trouble which may seriously interfere with any further scientific activity on his part. It is in the full belief that a short account of the latest results arrived at, by one who has exercised so remarkable an influence on the scientific thought of our time, may prove acceptable to a wider body of readers than that to which they are primarily addressed, that the following pages have been written.

It is well known that, speaking generally, every living being, whether animal or plant, begins existence as a cell ; that is to say, as a minute portion of protoplasm, or living substance, enclosing a nucleus. Some of the lowest forms of life (protozoa and protophyta) remain permanently in the unicellular condition ; but in the case of all except the lowest organisms the original cell divides, the resulting daughter-cells again dividing without losing their organic connexion one with another ; so that, after a longer or shorter repetition of the process, there results a multicellular organism of higher or lower degree of complexity.

In very nearly all multicellular individuals (called metazoa and metaphyta) the principle of division of labour is found to obtain among their constituent cells ; in any one of the higher animals, for instance, we find certain groups of cells told off to form the foundation of the muscular, and others that of the nervous system ; while still others take on the special functions of secretion, absorption, or mechanical

support to other tissues, as the case may be. So soon as this cell-differentiation, or division of labour, takes place—and we have seen that it comes into being with the very origin of multicellular organization—it manifests itself by the specializing of the reproductive function. In the unicellular animal or plant reproduction is effected by a simple dichotomy—each half growing into a likeness of the original undivided cell. In the multicellular organism, on the other hand, though each one of the component cells may be capable of further division, it is only a certain class of these component cells whose members are able, under appropriate circumstances, to reproduce by division, not merely cells more or less like themselves, but also complete models of the parent organism. To the cells of this latter class the name germ-cell is applied. In their finished condition, when ready for the office of reproduction, they are known in the female sex as ova, in the male as spermatozoa.

In most cases (though to this rule there are numerous exceptions) the germ-cell does not begin its work of starting a new individual until it has cast off certain portions of its substance and united with another germ-cell which has similarly undergone a process of 'reduction.' This phenomenon of cell-fusion, which is known as 'amphimixis,' is the essential feature in sexual reproduction. It must, however, be borne in mind that reproduction, even in highly organized multicellular animals, is by no means necessarily dependent on a sexual process. There are many cases in which asexual or unisexual generation alternates more or less regularly with bisexual, and some, even among animals so high in the scale as the crustacea (crabs, shrimps, and their allies), where the parthenogenetic mode of reproduction is the only one known. In certain instances parthenogenesis has even been induced artificially.

Upon the above considerations, which are matters of common knowledge and hardly open to dispute, Weismann founds the somewhat startling statement that the germ-cells are potentially immortal, and that all unicellular animals or plants, in which the individual *is* the germ-cell, are consequently endowed with the same property of potential immor-

talities. This dictum has been received in some quarters with opposition, and even with ridicule; Weismann's meaning, however, is really one to which no reasonable exception can be taken. He does not of course intend to convey that the protozoon or the germ-cell, any more than other cells, is exempt from the destructive action of many external causes; but what he does insist on is, that the death of the germ-cell, though it may be brought about by the death of the 'soma' that encloses it, or by other means, is not a physiological or natural process. On the contrary, the germ-cell shews no innate tendency towards decay and dissolution; and therefore may, and in fact does, go on living so long as surrounding conditions are favourable. This is not the case with those descendants of the ovum which constitute the 'soma'; *i.e.* the aggregate of cells which are not directly concerned in reproduction. The 'soma' has its natural period of organic existence, which tends to be terminated sooner or later by internal causes; any of its contained germ-cells which it may have liberated under appropriate conditions will, however, continue an independent existence, and furnish themselves with a new 'soma' of their own. It may perhaps be objected that a cell's identity is lost by its division into daughter-cells, even though these latter may grow by assimilation of nutriment into exact reproductions of the parent cell. To meet such an objection it is perhaps preferable to predicate potential immortality of the 'germ-plasm,' or essential living constituent of the germ-cell, rather than of the germ-cell itself. In this form Weismann's statement is, so far as our present knowledge goes, incontrovertible.

It has seemed probable to many observers, to Darwin amongst others, that the germ-plasm of the metazoa (or multicellular animals) is capable, while still enclosed within the body of the parent, of being profoundly influenced in constitution by the cells of the surrounding 'soma.' This supposed modification is imagined to take place not by mere assimilation of nutriment on the part of the germ-cells, but by a process which may rather be called 'accretion'; the germ-plasm being conceived of as being continually reinforced, and correspondingly altered, by the emanation from

the cells of the 'soma' of actual material particles which, in some unexplained way, are conducted to and stored up in the contained germ-plasm. This is, broadly speaking, what Darwin meant by his term Pangenesis. The theory is in many respects an attractive one, and its adoption would enable us to solve many difficult questions in heredity; but the existence of such a process is on physiological grounds highly improbable, or even inconceivable, and there is no direct evidence in its favour. Against it Weismann ranges his counter-theory of the 'continuity of the germ-plasm,' according to which the germ-plasm may indeed be fed by the nutritive fluids of the body, and may increase by assimilating such of their constituents as are suitable for ensuring its own growth, but does not acquire from them any intrinsic character which it did not possess before. In a certain sense, therefore, the germ-plasm is not only 'continuous,' but 'stable'; though Weismann does not deny—indeed, he now affirms with emphasis—the existence of sundry conditions of nutrition which may lead to a more or less rapid modification of the germ-plasm as it were from within. To put it shortly, the germ-plasm may assimilate, may grow, and may become modified in the process of growth; but it is not open to any direct alteration of its constitution by accretion from an external source.

We have used, without defining exactly, the term 'germ-plasm'; and it now becomes imperative to inquire what is the actual hereditary substance—the substance which, as has been shewn, appears to have no inherent tendency towards death, and which passes on from generation to generation, so long as conditions remain favourable, with its vitality unimpaired and its constitution comparatively stable. Many years have passed since the botanist Nägeli arrived at the conclusion that the material on which heredity depends must have a definite molecular constitution with an 'architecture' of its own: in other words, must be of the nature of a solid. A further deduction of his was that the material in each case must be minimal in quantity. The grounds on which the latter opinion was arrived at are as follows.

In most cases of sexual reproduction there is considerable

disparity of size between the two germ-cells (ovum and spermatozoon) which take part in the process of amphimixis. This difference in some instances becomes extreme; yet it is a well-known fact that, on an average, the collective progeny partakes in equal degree of the characters of its two parents. Hence, in those cases where the spermatozoon is very many times smaller than the ovum with which it unites, it must nevertheless contain the normal amount of hereditary material. And inasmuch as the relatively enormous size of the ovum is not found to be associated with any preponderance in the offspring of characters belonging to the female parent, it is fair to conclude that the true hereditary material in the female germ-cell, or ovum, must be equally minute in amount with that in the male germ-cell, or spermatozoon. This must be so, unless the hereditary substance of the male and of the female parent differ essentially in properties, which Weismann justly speaks of as an improbable assumption.

So far Nägeli; but we are now able to take a fresh step in advance, and to identify with a large measure of probability, if not with absolute certainty, the actual morphological elements of the cell to which must be attributed the office of carrying on its ancestral qualities. These elements, therefore, will constitute the true hereditary material of which we are in search.

In order to appreciate the nature of the reasoning on which this identification is based, it will be necessary to consider in some detail the facts that are at present known about the structure of the body which has been already spoken of as the 'cell-nucleus.' This is a more or less globular sac included within the protoplasmic body of the cell—to use a homely simile, like a raisin in a dumpling. Under ordinary circumstances it is limited by a well-marked 'nuclear membrane,' and may shew within its substance one or more minute particles called 'nucleoli'—the skin and the 'stones' of the raisin respectively. Neither nuclear membrane nor nucleolus is to be regarded as an essential part of the nuclear structure, at least so far as the material of heredity is concerned. But on a careful examination of a 'resting'

cell, that is, a cell which is not undergoing division, there may be seen within the nucleus a very fine network—or, perhaps more accurately, sponge-work—of threads, in connexion with which system of threads occurs a larger or smaller number of minute granules. These granules are generally very receptive of the ordinary stains used in microscopic investigation, and they have accordingly been distinguished by the name of chromatin granules, the substance of which they are formed being known collectively as chromatin.

When a cell is about to divide, the chromatin goes through a very remarkable series of changes. In the first place, the scattered chromatin granules arrange themselves into a long coiled thread—the chromatin substance becoming thereby far more conspicuous than it was while in the resting condition. This thread next becomes broken up into several pieces of equal length, constant in number for any given species of plant or animal, which are usually known as the 'chromosomes.' Each chromosome, after thickening and sometimes looping, or bending, divides longitudinally into two halves; the original number of chromosomes thus becoming doubled. While these changes have been in progress, another series of transformations has taken place within the cell, which may be briefly referred to as the 'doubling of the centrosome' and 'formation of the nuclear spindle.' These latter processes, although of the highest interest, need not for our present purpose be described in detail. It will be sufficient to say that in some way not understood they control the distribution of the chromosomes between the two daughter-cells into which the original mother-cell is now dividing; the final result being that one half of each original chromosome moves into one daughter-cell and the other half into the other. In this way each daughter-cell contains the same number of chromosomes as the mother-cell contained before they became doubled in number by the longitudinal cleavage. It also follows from the preceding account that each of the original chromosomes is represented in each of the daughter-cells of the second generation. When the daughter-cells assume independent existence, the chromosomes relapse



into the original 'resting condition' of a fine sponge-work with included granules. If a supply of appropriate nutrition is available, and other conditions are also favourable, the daughter-cells may rapidly assume the size and appearance of their progenitor, and each daughter-cell may presently become a mother-cell in its turn.

'Thus we can understand that the number of chromosomes remains the same in every cell-generation throughout development, as it is the same in all the individuals of a species. The numbers are known for many species: in some worms there are only two or four chromosomes, while in other related worms there are eight: in the grasshopper there are twelve, and in a marine worm, *Sagitta*, eighteen; in the mouse, the trout, and the lily there are twenty-four; in some snails thirty-two; in the sharks thirty-six; and in *Artemia*, a little salt-water crustacean, 168 chromosomes. In man the chromosomes are so small that their normal number is not certain—sixteen have been counted. This counting can only be done during the process of a nuclear division, for afterwards the chromosomes flow indistinguishably together, . . . only to reappear, however, in the old form and number whenever the nucleus again begins to divide.'<sup>1</sup>

It is this chromatin substance of the nucleus, always present, though sometimes only to be recognized with difficulty, and appearing at certain times in the form of definite 'chromosomes,' equal in size and, for the same species, constant in number, which Weismann, who is at one in this respect with Strasburger and O. Hertwig, holds to be the true material of heredity. The chief grounds on which this conclusion is based will become clear after a little further consideration of the subject of nuclear constitution in its relation to cell-division and to reproduction.

It will be remembered that the phenomenon of 'amphimixis,' which is a usual, though not an invariable, preliminary to reproduction, consists essentially in the fusion of a male with a female germ-cell, termed a spermatozoon and ovum respectively. Now both the mature ovum and the mature spermatozoon, though they are quite properly entitled to the

<sup>1</sup> The passages here quoted from Weismann's latest work are given in the words of the excellent English translation, under the title of 'The Evolution Theory,' which we have placed at the head of our article.



designation of 'cells,' differ in an important respect from the ordinary cells of the body, including the germ-cells themselves before maturation. This difference lies in the fact that, in all ordinary cases, the mature ovum or spermatozoon contains only half the number of chromosomes proper to the species, the other half having been got rid of by a process of 'reducing division.' This reducing division resembles an ordinary cell-division in the fact that it is accompanied by the formation of a 'nuclear spindle'; it departs from the usual type of division in the fact that the chromosomes do not undergo cleavage, but are separated one from another as units, so that only half instead of the whole equipment of chromatin substance is represented in each resulting daughter-cell. It is not here necessary to trace the ultimate destiny of the extruded chromosomes, which differs in different cases; the immediately important point is that after the fusion of the ovum with the spermatozoon, the nucleus of each is visible within the protoplasm of the ovum as a sac containing half the number of chromosomes proper to the species. These two nuclei, the male and the female, eventually coalesce, and thus form a nucleus with the normal number of chromosomes. The resulting body is known as the 'segmentation nucleus,' and by its subsequent division, which is carried on in the ordinary manner through successive generations of daughter-cells, the body of the new individual is built up. In the above brief recital many details have necessarily been omitted, but the general significance of these facts in respect to the identification of the hereditary substance will now be apparent.

Weismann's argument may be summarized as follows. The cell-protoplasm cannot be the bearer of hereditary qualities; otherwise we should find the paternal and maternal shares in the characters of the offspring varying in accordance with the relative amount of protoplasm in ovum and spermatozoon, which is not the case. On the other hand, there are elements (the chromosomes) which are contributed in equal number and in at any rate approximately equal size by both parents. Inasmuch as the 'segmentation nucleus' contains paternal and maternal chromosomes in equal numbers, and in its own first division, together with all subsequent divisions

(speaking generally) of its descendants, the usual cleavage of chromosomes and separation of their halves takes place (each original chromosome being consequently represented in every successive product of division), it follows that the body of the offspring partakes of the substance of its parents, so far as the chromatin is concerned, in equal amount. By appealing to experience we find that on the whole the inheritance of paternal and maternal characters is approximately equal, and we are therefore, Weismann would say, justified in coming to the conclusion that in the chromatin substance we have discovered the true material of heredity.

It must be borne in mind that, in speaking of parental inheritance as approximately equal on both sides, we are only concerning ourselves with *average* results. Individual instances, as everyone's experience will testify, are liable to extraordinary diversity in this respect. The matter has, however, been carefully investigated statistically and otherwise; and, with reservations which do not really affect the main point, it may be taken as well established that *on the whole*, in 'amphigonic' or sexual reproduction, the two parents take an equal share in determining the characters of the offspring. The consideration of cases of individual diversity belongs to another department of the subject, which may occupy our attention later.

Supposing it to be conceded that in the chromatin substance of the germ-cell we have the actual material of heredity—the true undying germ-plasm—the next question which presents itself for solution is of this kind:—what can we infer of the actual structure or constitution of the germ-plasm? Is it to be regarded as containing within itself a material foreshadowing of the various and complicated cell-assemblages which make up the body of the adult; or can we imagine it to consist of a substance practically homogeneous, or at least made up of similar parts which in virtue of intrinsic or extrinsic forces can give rise in the course of development to the different categories of cells with their various modifications of structure and function? On this point Weismann parts company with many modern biologists. The former or 'preformation' view, which sup-

poses the existence within the germ-plasm of living material particles, 'each of which stands in a definite relation to particular cells or kinds of cells in the organism to be developed,' appears to him to be the only one compatible with observed facts. The latter view, which ever since the time of K. von Wolff has been known as the 'theory of epigenesis,' is virtually the same as that held by Herbert Spencer, and in a modified form by Oscar Hertwig. There are difficulties connected with its acceptance which to Weismann appear fatal.

Space would fail us for a discussion of the evidence which can be brought in support of, or in opposition to, these conflicting theories of the constitution of the germ-plasm. It is fair, however, to say that Weismann's conception is at least consistent with itself, and that his arguments, both constructive and destructive, are ably put together and weightily urged. But our author is not content with a mere assertion of the principle of 'preformation.' His next step is to assign a definite 'architecture' to the hereditary substance. There is, he considers, a perfectly arranged system by which the various 'primary constituents' (*Anlagen*, as he calls them) of the eventual adult body are grouped within the germ-plasm, occupying with regard to each other a definite local relation. Moreover, he shews reasons for thinking that the chromatin substance of each germ-cell contains the primary constituents corresponding not to one individual only, but to several; although, in almost every case, but one individual results from the development of a single ovum. For the packet or bundle (if the expression may be allowed) of *Anlagen* which represents all the parts of a perfect organism like the parent, Weismann has invented the term 'id.' The 'id,' it may be said, is the personal or individual unit in the germ-plasm. Although it contains, in Weismann's view, the primary constituents of a complete example of the species, it does not do more in the process of development than take its share with the other 'ids' of the same germ-cell in the production of a single new individual, which new organism may be regarded as the 'resultant' of the co-operation or struggle of the whole assemblage of 'ids' concerned.

Each chromosome of the germ-cell may contain many 'ids'; and in cases where the chromosome assumes a moniliform or rosary-like structure, Weismann is inclined to consider the granular particles, of which the chromosome then appears to be made up, as each constituting a separate 'id.' On this view the grouping of the 'ids' within the chromosome is a simple matter, and it may be of little importance whether the chromosome contains more or fewer of them—the former being presumably the case when the chromosomes themselves are not numerous. The 'ids' are morphologically equivalent units, and their relation in the chromosome is simply one of juxtaposition. But within the 'id' itself the conditions must be more complex. Here, says Weismann, it is necessary to postulate the existence of different living parts each of which stands in a definite relation to one of the particular constituent cell-groups of the adult organism; and further, it is necessary to suppose that the arrangement of these living parts within the 'id' must be of such a kind as to ensure that each primary constituent shall reach the right place at the right time in the course of development. To these hypothetical particles Weismann gives the name of 'determinants,' because he looks upon them as being endowed with the power of controlling the cells which they are ultimately destined to enter, and of determining the character which these cells shall assume. It may assist in the comprehension of the doctrine of 'determinants' if at this point we cite a few passages in which the author has sought to furnish more or less definite answers to some of the questions which naturally suggest themselves in connexion with his theory. In the first place, he reminds us, there is little or nothing to be gained, in the way of simplifying the conception, by supposing that one primary constituent or 'determinant' may so divide itself up in the course of development as to serve as the antecedent of more than one kind of structure.

'The question would then arise, How is it able to do so? And the answer can be no other than that the single first determinant had within it several different kinds of elements, which subsequently

separated to determine in different ways the various appendages. But that is just another way of saying that this single determinant actually includes within itself several different determinants. For a determinant means nothing more than an element of the germ-substance by whose presence in the germ the specific development of a particular part of the body is conditioned. If we could remove the determinants of a particular appendage from the germ-plasm, this appendage would not develop; if we could cause it to vary, the appendage also would turn out differently.

'In this general sense the determinants of the germ-plasm are not hypothetical but actual; just as surely as if we had seen them with our eyes, and followed their development. Hypothesis begins when we attempt to make creatures of flesh and blood out of these mere symbols, and to say how they are constituted. But even here there are some things which may be maintained with certainty; for instance, that they are *not* miniature models, in Bonnet's sense, of the parts which they determine; and, further, that they are not lifeless material, mere substances, but living parts, vital units. If this were not so they would not remain as they are throughout the course of development, but would be displaced and destroyed by the metabolism, instead of dominating it as living matter alone can do—doubtless undergoing oxidation, but at the same time assimilating material from without, and thereby growing. There cannot be lifeless determinants; they must be living units capable of nutrition, growth, and multiplication by division.'

The relative position of 'determinants' within the 'id' must be a matter of systematic arrangement, for

'the first condition that must be fulfilled in order that a determinant may be able to control a cell or cell-group is that it should succeed in getting into it. It must be guided through the numerous cell-divisions of ontogeny so that it shall ultimately come to lie in the cells which it is to control. This presupposes that each determinant has from the very beginning its definite position in relation to the rest, and that the germ-plasm, therefore, is not a mere loose aggregate of determinants, but that it possesses a structure, an architecture, in which the individual determinants have each their definite place. The position of the determinants in relation to one another . . . depends partly on their historical development from earlier ancestral determinants, partly on internal forces.'

In its ultimate analysis, living substance must consist, according to many investigators, of almost inconceivably

minute organized units—in size far below the limits of visibility, though themselves consisting of a group of chemical molecules. These assumed vital units are called by Weismann ‘biophors.’ While differing from each other in composition, they must possess in common a definite fundamental plan, on which depends their endowment of life. What this plan may be, by what kind of bridge the passage may be made from non-living to living matter, is, in spite of recent surmises, still an unsolved problem. But, whatever may be the secret of their constitution, it is as a group of biophors, ‘bound together by internal forces to form a higher vital unity,’ that Weismann is inclined to picture the ‘determinant’ in any of the higher plants or animals.

We have now arrived at a more or less complete notion of the germ-plasm, or hereditary substance of the germ-cell, according to Weismann’s conception. It is, we have seen, particulate, living, capable of growth and of division, continuous from generation to generation, and shewing no inherent tendency towards dissolution. With regard to its intimate composition we have in a descending scale, first the chromosome; then the ‘id’; below this the ‘determinant’; below this again the ‘biophor’; and finally the chemical molecule. Beneath the level of the ‘biophor,’ life is non-existent; the molecule and the atom belong to the domain of chemistry or chemical physics.

For the sake of simplicity, the process of cell-division has for the most part been spoken of as if it always resulted in the formation of daughter-cells identical in nature with their parent. It is obvious, however, that this is not always and everywhere the case; otherwise there could be no cell-differentiation. The division of a germ-cell could then only produce new germ-cells, and the various cell-assemblages known as ‘tissues’ could never arise, unless indeed on some theory of epigenesis such as Weismann pronounces inadmissible. As a matter of fact it would seem under any theory of cell-constitution that there must exist two kinds of division: one in which the daughter-cells are identical in composition with each other and with the parent cell; the other in which the two daughter-cells are dissimilar, and cannot therefore



both be precise counterparts of their parent. To these two kinds of division Weismann applies respectively the terms *erbgleich* and *erbungleich*, or integral and differential. The first takes place when the germ-cells multiply as germ-cells, or when any of the specialized cells in the developmental history of an organism increase in number by division; the second comes into play when, for instance, a germ-cell gives rise to a descendant whose subsequent history is purely 'somatic,' or when, of the two immediate descendants of the same 'somatic' cell, one joins the outer and the other the inner layer of the body.

It may be noted in passing that the conception of integral and differential division, which must *ex hypothesi* be capable of alternating with one another in the building up of the body of the adult, involves certain difficulties in connexion with the theory of 'preformation.' When differentiation appears among the descendants of a cell which has for generations been dividing 'integrally,' what determines this appearance? Is it predetermined in the original germ? If so, the previous divisions were not really integral; otherwise the differentiation would appear in all the descendants, not only in some of them. Again, why does the segmentation nucleus divide sometimes integrally and sometimes differentially? Weismann's answer to objections of this kind is to be found in his assumption that there are forces interacting among the different 'determinants' and controlling their mutual position within the 'ids,' the nature and mode of operation of which forces still remain entirely unknown to us. The only alternative to an assumption of this kind would seem to be the adoption of some theory akin to epigenesis.

If Weismann's conception of a complex and continuous germ-plasm—shedding off, as it were, the 'soma' by means of differential cell-division—corresponds in any close degree with the reality, it is obvious that no scope is allowed for any transmission of functional modifications. These modifications affect *ex hypothesi* the 'soma' alone; their field of operation is confined to the life of the individual. Now the individual in his relation to the germ-plasm is a



mere temporary trustee; it is true that his own 'soma' is derived from germ-plasm; but the portion of germ-plasm of which he himself is the bearer remains normally in his custody as an unaltered residue, nor does there appear to be any possible means by which the modifications which may be impressed by external conditions upon the tissues that collectively constitute his 'soma' can be reflected upon the germ-plasm of which the same 'soma' is the containing casket. We are not, however, obliged to assume that the germ-plasm, which is as dependent for its life and growth upon proper conditions of nutriment as are all other kinds of living matter, must remain entirely unaffected by the treatment to which it is subjected within the body; on the contrary, there is every reason to suppose that, for instance, the drenching of it with alcohol or other such substance by means of the blood-stream may be attended with deleterious results. It is also certain that the germ-plasm may be the subject of direct infection from a disease contracted by its custodian; and there is evidence that in certain cases among the lower animals whose apparatus for regulating their bodily heat is imperfect or absent, it may be permanently altered by exposure to unusually high or low degrees of temperature, while still contained within the body of the parent. But it should be carefully observed that not one of these or similar phenomena is a true instance of hereditary transmission, though in such cases inheritance may sometimes be simulated. What has really happened is that the germ-plasm has, so to speak, been 'got at' and altered directly by external influences in spite of the enveloping 'soma,' which in ordinary circumstances should act as a protector. From the 'soma,' however, it inherits nothing; though any permanent alteration brought about in its own constitution will of course be transmitted to its own descendants. It may further be conceded that changes in the containing 'soma' may influence the nutrition of the contained germ-plasm in more than one direction; but Weismann maintains—and it is hard to see how he can be mistaken—that a change in any part of the 'soma' is no more likely to bring about the same kind of change in the corresponding constituents of the germ-plasm than a tele-

graphic message sent off in English is likely to be received in China in the language of that country. To this it may be added that between 'soma' and germ there appears to exist neither communicating cable nor wireless telegraphy.

Supposing then that the continuity of the germ-plasm is granted, are we further justified in asserting its complete stability? This question would be answered by Weismann in the negative. The constitution of the germ-plasm, he would say, is not very easily or rapidly altered, but its stability is not absolute. Besides the instances which have just been given of the alteration of the hereditary material under the direct influence of sundry external conditions, there is strong presumptive evidence that the germ-plasm is capable of changes which may be called, in a certain sense, intrinsic or spontaneous. In reference to this point, on which Weismann has to some extent shifted, or, as some would prefer to put it, enlarged and defined his view, it will be convenient to devote some consideration to the general subject of variation.

The fact of individual variation is a matter of common experience. The more intimate our acquaintance with examples of any given species of animal or plant, the more surely do we recognize that no two of them are absolutely identical in bodily structure. Something may of course be credited to the influence upon the 'soma' of external conditions, which can hardly be the same for any two individuals, however similar their surroundings. But when full allowance has been made for the effect of any diversity in environment, there remains the certainty that congenital differences *do* exist, even between the children of the same parents. This fact was used by both Darwin and Wallace as a starting-point for their theory of natural selection; neither of these observers, however, felt himself in a position to explain it. The phenomenon of variation has in fact always been more or less of a *crux* in the theory of evolution. If the Lamarckian doctrine of use-inheritance and the transmission of functional modifications could be accepted, the difficulty would be to some slight extent removed, though even then the majority of the facts concerned would still lack an explanation. For those who agree with Weismann in holding the Lamarckian

or 'centripetal' view to be improbable in itself and unsupported by evidence, it is clear that the key to the problem must be sought in another direction. Weismann himself has attacked the question with characteristic courage, and has reached, as he believes, at least a partial explanation of this difficult subject.

It will be remembered that in preparation for the process of nuclear fusion in amphimixis, each of the parental nuclei has divested itself of half its equipment of chromosomes. Now if we can regard the chromosome as an assemblage of 'ids,' which, though generally resembling one another, are to some extent diverse in constitution, it will follow that the removal of whole chromosomes will have not merely a quantitative but also a qualitative effect—that is to say, that the residual chromatin will not only be lessened in amount, but will also differ in constitution from the original stock of that material. In order to make this point clearer, Weismann borrows Hartog's illustration of a pack of playing-cards. Let such a pack be cut at random into two equal parts; this will represent the 'reducing division' of one sex-cell. The division will be quantitative in respect of the number of cards, and qualitative in respect of their character; the division, that is, though equal so far as relating to mere counting of cards, will be in all probability unequal with regard to red and black, court cards and plain cards, aces and tens. Hence the resultant of the one half (which may for the purpose of this illustration be considered as the sum of arbitrarily assigned card values) will almost certainly differ from that of the second half, although the number of cards in each is equal. The amount of disparity will differ, within limits, for each pack so cut. Now let the halves, taken at random, of two packs be placed together. The result will be a pack equal in number to one of the original packs, but very different in constitution. Some cards will occur twice over others will not be represented at all, while the relative proportions of red and black, court cards and plain cards, will almost certainly be very different from what they were in the original undivided pack. The 'resultant,' so to speak, will be correspondingly altered. This represents in a rough way

what Weismann conceives to be happening in the fusion of two nuclei, each of which has lost half its chromosomes. The two original packs represent the array of chromosomes in the male and female nucleus respectively, the individual cards stand for the 'ids.' The new pack formed from two halves of the original ones is a picture of the chromatin substance of the combined or 'segmentation' nucleus, and just as in its combination of cards and therefore in its resultant it is different from one of the unaltered packs, so the resultant of the 'ids' in the new segmentation nucleus will be something different from that of the original assemblage of 'ids' in the germ-plasm of either parent. The imperfections of this illustration are obvious, and need not be detailed; but if we can regard the individual germ-cells as being in some degree analogous to our separate packs of cards, we can perhaps by its help arrive at some idea of Weismann's suggestion as to the possible source of one kind of individual variation.

It will be observed that the foregoing reasoning will have no actual validity unless we can assume the existence of individual differences between the 'ids.' Supposing such differences to exist, to what can we consider them to be due? In the first place, it may be remembered that each 'id' of a given germ-cell in all probability embodies a different line of ancestry. This, however, would not be a reason for divergence of character between them, unless they either differed at the outset or were able to vary intrinsically and independently in the course of their developmental history. We have seen that the germ-plasm, in Weismann's view, is to be considered as having a continuous existence since the time when all organisms, whether animals or plants, were unicellular. In the protozoon and protophyton the germ-cell is the body-cell and *vice versa*; if, therefore, the organism can be modified by external conditions, such modification will tend to affect the future generations of its descendants. It is perhaps not inconceivable that differences so induced among the ancestral protozoa may still survive, and find expression among the primary constituents of their multicellular descendants; this, at any rate, was once thought possible by Weismann.

It will, however, be generally agreed that such a shuffling

and recombination of 'ids' as may take place in amphimixis, even with the help of such id-variations as may have had their root among the ancestral protozoa, will not adequately account for the facts of variation as we know them. They will at best produce fresh combinations of already existing elements, and it is not easy to see how they can be capable of originating any structure that is actually new. We are therefore driven to seek for some cause of variation which shall operate more or less continually within the 'ids' themselves—not by way of accretion from without, nor by alteration directly induced by external interference, but by way of intrinsic and, as it were, spontaneous modification. This necessity is fully admitted by Weismann, who now considers that by his theory of 'germinal selection' he has at last solved the difficulty. The substance of this theory, which was first put forward in 1895, may be best gathered from Weismann's own statement, as follows :

'If our view be correct that the individual and different living units of the germ-plasm are determinants—that is, are the primary constituents of particular parts of the organism, in the sense that these parts could not arise if their determinants were absent from the germ-plasm, and that they would be different if the determinants were differently composed—we can draw far-reaching deductions. It is true that we cannot learn *anything directly* in regard to the intimate structure of the germ-plasm, and even in regard to the vital processes going on within it we can only guess a very little, but so much we may say—that its living parts are nourished, and that they multiply. But it follows from this that nourishment in a dissolved state must penetrate between its vital particles, and that whether the determinants grow, and at what rate they do so, depends mainly on the amount of nourishment which reaches them.

'If each kind of determinant always secured the same quantity of nourishment, all would grow in the same degree, that is, in exact proportion to their power of assimilation. But we know that in less minute conditions, which we can observe more directly, there is nowhere absolute equality; that all vital processes are subject to fluctuations; any little obstacles in the current of the nutritive fluid, or in its composition, may cause poorer nutrition of one part, better of another. . . . It seems to me that it is upon the unequal nutrition of the determinants, conditioned by the chances of the food supply,

that individual hereditary variability ultimately depends. . . . I have called these processes which are ceaselessly going on within the germ-plasm, germinal selection, because they are analogous to those processes of selection which we already know in connexion with the larger vital units, cells, cell-groups, and persons.'

The germ-plasm, then, in Weismann's present view, is very far from being absolutely stable; it is on the contrary subject to ceaseless modification, though no doubt the results of such modification may be a long time in finding visible expression. The principle above enunciated, if true, will undoubtedly go far towards explaining the phenomena of individual variation.

It will be seen from the above passages of our author—which, though somewhat abridged in quotation, we believe to present as they stand a fair statement of this part of his theory—that he regards the principle of selection as of extremely wide application in the field of evolution. Not only does it obtain in the form of 'personal selection,' the kind of selection whose significance in evolution was first worked out by Darwin and Wallace, but it also bears sway in the struggle for existence between groups of individuals, communities, and species. Further still, Weismann would assign it a rôle among the organs and tissues of an individual body, among the cells of a tissue, and, as we have seen, among the invisible constituents of the germ-plasm itself: in a word, among all categories of vital units. This is a large conception, which, whether fully justified or not, contains sufficient truth to challenge serious attention.

What, then, it may be asked, are the most distinctive points in Weismann's presentment of the theory of evolution? We may perhaps summarize them as follows:

- (1) The conception of the substance which carries the hereditary qualities of living beings as being composed of definite structural antecedents of the future offspring, these antecedents being arranged in local relation to one another according to a definite 'architectural' plan.
- (2) The identification of this hereditary material as the chromatin substance of the cell-nucleus.
- (3) The attribution to this hereditary substance, whether



contained in unicellular or multicellular organisms, of the property of 'potential immortality'; in other words, the statement that the 'germ-plasm,' as distinct from the general bodily structure, or 'soma,' has no inherent tendency towards dissolution or death.

(4) The absolute denial of any such direct *rapport* between 'soma' and germ as is implied in the Lamarckian doctrine of the inheritance of the effects of use and disuse, or of other functional modifications.

(5) The origin of variations for the most part from within, and not from without.

(6) The predominance of the factor of selection as the most important and controlling principle in relation to all the categories of vital units and all the processes of life.

The account which has here been offered of Weismann's position as finally stated in the book before us is necessarily very incomplete. It is obviously impossible within the space at our disposal to do justice either to the wealth of learning or the powers of exposition and argument which belong to the veteran author. We have found ourselves obliged to omit entirely many points of high interest and importance. But it may be hoped that the present sketch, inadequate as it is, may have the effect of sending some readers to the work itself, whether in its original form or in the able translation prepared by Professor and Mrs. J. Arthur Thomson.

There is one point on which a word may be added. It has been somewhat rashly asserted that the acceptance of Weismann's doctrine of the continuity of the germ-plasm would tend in human affairs to destroy the sense of moral obligation towards posterity. This is, of course, a serious error. There is no warrant for the statement that under Weismann's theory a man's actions have no effect upon his potential descendants, even as regards their bodily structure; while apart from this the whole question of the influence of nurture, training and example—education in the widest sense—remains absolutely unaffected by any theory of inheritance properly so called.

Lastly, it may not be amiss to transcribe, from the conclusion of Weismann's monumental work, a few words addressed



by him to those who fear that the doctrine of evolution will be the overthrow of their faith :

'Let them not forget,' he says, 'that truth can only be harmful, and may even be destructive, when we have only half grasped it, or when we try to evade it. If we follow it unafraid, we shall come now and in the future to the conclusion that a limit is set to our knowledge by our own minds, and that beyond this limit begins the region of faith.'

## SHORT NOTICES.

### I.—BIBLICAL STUDIES.

*The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers.* By a Committee of the OXFORD SOCIETY OF HISTORICAL THEOLOGY. (Oxford : at the Clarendon Press, 1905.) Price 6s. net.

THIS very scholarly work is an attempt to investigate as accurately as possible the use of the New Testament in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. It was undertaken by a Committee appointed by the Society of Historical Theology at Oxford, and, as the names of the Committee would lead us to expect, the work has been done in an exceedingly accurate and scholarly way. The list of passages included is full and complete, and the comments upon them are very sensible. The work is of great value ; but at the same time, we find it necessary to criticize the plan upon which it is arranged. An attempt has been made to give a certain appearance of mechanical accuracy to the results attained by dividing the books of the New Testament into classes. Each class is distinguished by the letters A., B., C., D., according to the degree of probability as to its use by the several authors. Class A. includes those books about which there can be no reasonable doubt. Class B. comprises those the use of which reaches a high degree of probability. In Class C. a lower degree of probability is attained. In Class D. are placed books which may possibly be referred to. It is suggested then that conclusions can be tabulated in this way which have a certain objective value. As a matter of fact, this is entirely delusive. Problems such as those of Church history cannot be so treated,—they are much too complex. To illustrate our point we will refer to the use made of St. Paul's Epistles by St. Polycarp. It is well known that the

Epistle of St. Polycarp is filled with Pauline phraseology. Had he then St. Paul's Epistles before him? According to the table of results given at the end of this work, he certainly had 1 Corinthians and probably had Romans, 11 Cor., Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, 11 Thess., 1 and 11 Timothy. He possibly had Colossians. Now surely here the evidence is cumulative. The resemblance to any one of these Epistles alone might be only probable, but it is inconceivable that resemblances similar to these seven Epistles could arise from any cause except the fact that Polycarp had them before him. There can therefore be no reasonable doubt that he used them, and the evidence really belongs to Class A. Then again, with regard to Colossians, three passages are quoted in Class D. The resemblance in each case is quite correctly stated to be only slight, but if we know already that Polycarp had most of St. Paul's Epistles before him, and if we find these slight resemblances to the Colossians, surely the probability that St. Polycarp used Colossians is very much higher. Then there is a further point. We find with regard to Colossians that there are possibly resemblances in Barnabas, 1 Clement, and Ignatius. Here again the witness of four different writers to the Epistle makes the evidence cumulative. It will be very unlikely that four different writers should hit upon similar language independently.

We make these criticisms because we think that a first glance at the table of results might lead to very incorrect conclusions. We can quite imagine someone saying that this investigation proves that there are only four books of the New Testament about the use of which there can be no reasonable doubt. As a matter of fact, there can be no reasonable doubt that the Apostolic Fathers had most of the books of the New Testament before them. Apart from this the work has been exceedingly well done and will be of the greatest use to scholars; but we must warn the writers of it that it is just as easy to arrive at an erroneous conclusion by understatement as by over-statement, and that to reject a work which is genuine is just as bad criticism as to accept a work which is false.

*S. Hieronymi Tractatus in Psalmos XIV., &c.* 'Anecdota Maredsolana,' III. 3. Edidit D. GERMANUS MORIN. (Maredsous. Oxford: Parker.)

THE new volume of this collection of hitherto unpublished manuscripts maintains the high standard of accurate scholarship characteristic of the series. In the preface the editor deals briefly with the authorship of the documents, which include a commentary on fourteen

Psalms, two short tractates on Is. i. 1-6, vi. 1-7, some fragments of the Psalms in Greek, all purporting to have been written by St. Jerome; an appendix is added containing brief comments, by Arnobius, on certain passages from the Gospels.

The most important of these documents is the first. With regard to the subject-matter, two things strike one: firstly, the exegesis, which is at times almost *naïve*, at times very beautiful; secondly, the character of the text, not of the Psalms commented on, but of the frequent quotations from other books which occur in the commentary. Only a very few instances, out of many, can be here given. First as to the exegesis: the title of Ps. lxxxiv. (Hebr. lxxxv.) runs, 'In finem filiis Chore psalmus;' the comment on this is: 'Chore interpretatur Calvaria, locus dominicae passionis.' The reference is, of course, to Matt. xxvii. 33, and parallel passages; 'Chore' is taken as though from the root קרה 'to make bald' (which in its origin is possible), and is thus brought into connexion with 'the place of a skull'! In Ps. lxxxvii. 9 (Hebr. lxxxviii. 9), the words, 'Posuerunt me abominationem sibi' have a somewhat forced interpretation: 'Iudaei scilicet dicentes, "Crucifige, crucifige talem: nos non habemus regem nisi Caesarem."' On the other hand, we find many comments such as these: Ps. lxxxiv. 3 (Hebr. lxxxv. 3), 'Remisisti iniquitatem plebis tuae.' 'Hoc in baptismo credimus esse completum.' Again, in writing of the anthropomorphism contained in Ps. lxxxvii. 3 (Hebr. lxxxviii. 3), 'Inclina aurem tuam ad precem meam,' a remark is made which might with profit be borne in mind by many commentators: 'Fragilitate humana loquitur scriptura, ut nos facilius quod dicitur intellegamus.' One other example may be given, Ps. lxxxviii. 2 (Hebr. lxxxix. 2): 'Misericordias tuas Domine in aeternum cantabo.' In commenting on this a beautiful thought is expressed in the words: 'Non dixit misericordiam, sed misericordias. Si unum esset peccatum, una opus erit misericordia: quoniam ergo plura sunt peccata, plurimae sunt et misericordiae.' In the second place, there is much in this volume which is of considerable importance to the textual critic. The quotations from the Psalms themselves are from the Vulgate<sup>1</sup>; but frequently we meet with quotations from other books which are presumably Old Latin, e.g. Is. iv. 4, Nah. i. 9, Mic. ii. 9, &c. Then there are a certain number of renderings according to the versions of Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, &c. Some are in Field's *Hexapla*, some are not; others, again, differ from Field. Of the latter here is an example: The title of Psalm ix. runs, למנצח על־מות לבן;

<sup>1</sup> One exception occurs in lxxxviii. 2, 'Misericordias tuas Domine' (LXX, τὰ ἐλέη σου Κύριε . . .); while the Vulg. reads: 'Misericordias Domini . . .'

Symmachus, according to Field, rendered this: Ἐπινίκιον περὶ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ; in this volume the rendering of Symmachus is translated: 'Triumphus adolescentiae filii.' Quinta, according to Field, gives τῇ νικοποιῇ ὑπὲρ ἀκμῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ; in the translation before us: 'Triumphus florentis iuventutis filii.' An interesting case of a rendering *not* occurring in Field is that in Psalm xv. 11:

Th.: 'Adimplebis me septem laetitiae cum vultu tuo delectatio in dextra tua. Victori.'

Sym.: 'Adimplebis me plenitudo laetitiarum cum facie tua (*vel* "apud faciem tuam") delectatio in' etc.

As regards the Greek fragments from the Psalms, we cannot help thinking that Dom Morin has made a mistake in his description of the manuscript, which he gives as 'graeca in Psalmos fragmenta ex codice Taurinensi graec. B. vii. 30, saec. ut videtur x/xi.' The manuscript so numbered was, until recently, a complete uncial Psalter of the sixth century; the text was surrounded by a Catena. We recently held in our hands the small heap of ashes which was all that remained of this priceless treasure after the recent disastrous fire at the Turin library. A few letters in the centre of each page are decipherable, but the comments which form the bulk of these extracts are irretrievably lost.

The work done by Dom Morin is altogether admirable; the volume must be studied to realize this. Scholars are deeply indebted to him for editing this series. We have only been able to draw attention to the merest fraction of what the volume before us really offers.

*The Epistle of St. James.* With an Introduction and Notes by R. J. KNOWLING, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in King's College, London, and Boyle Lecturer. 'Westminster Commentaries.' (London: Methuen and Co.) Price 6s.

DR. KNOWLING has given us a characteristically comprehensive commentary on this difficult book. The introduction deals with the usual topics, but exhibits an unusual range of acquaintance with the labours of other commentators both at home and abroad. It may safely be said that no serious attempt to grapple with the questions raised by this Epistle has been left unnoticed or unweighed. The result is a forcible and fair statement in support of the position assigned to the Epistle by Weiss, Zahn, Mayor, and others. It is the earliest book of the New Testament, written and issued before the 'Council of Jerusalem,' destined for Jewish Christians, mainly in Palestine and Syria. While allowing full weight, or even

more, to the Jewish character both of writer, readers, and circumstances, Dr. Knowling discusses and rejects the theory of Spitta, that we have in it a Jewish document, interpolated with an occasional Christian phrase for the use of Christian readers, as decisively as he rejects Harnack's suggestion that it is a Christian document of the second century, probably a collection of fragments from an unknown preacher, issued under the ægis of an assumed name. But in all cases the view which is combated is stated fully and fairly, and every opportunity is given to the reader to judge for himself. At the same time, hardly enough weight is given to the difficulties attending the assumption of so early a date. It is, of course, extremely difficult to reinstate, as it were, the conditions and circumstances of the early Jewish Christian societies. Yet, allowing for a full measure of human weakness and Jewish proclivities, it is still difficult to suppose that in the first twenty years after Pentecost the weeds could have grown so rank as is suggested by the third, fourth, and part of the fifth chapters. If we remember that at that time there could have been nothing to gain in joining these societies, except, perhaps, for paupers, does it not appear strange that the warnings and reproaches which our Lord addressed to the most obstinate opponents of the Gospel should be already, as is argued, applicable to His still recent disciples?

To this difficulty on the side of moral conditions must be added the difficulty, which has often been pointed out, lying in the manner in which St. James presents Christian doctrine, if we may use the word in a wide sense. The problem may be stated thus: While all other evidence goes to shew that the progress of the early apprehension of truth moved from the concrete and personal to the more abstract and general, how is it that the doctrinal presentment in this Epistle is almost wholly of the latter type, if the Epistle itself belongs to the earliest stage? This problem is hardly considered by Dr. Knowling. And it is one which demands a very careful consideration.

The commentary, like the introduction, gives the student an abundance of material for the interpretation and illustration of the text. In this direction it cannot fail to be of the highest usefulness. If the notes sometimes seem overweighted and deficient in lucidity, something, no doubt, must be sacrificed where so much is gained. And a careful reader may be confident that difficulties of interpretation are fully and fairly considered. We can heartily recommend this book as fully maintaining the high standard of the series in which it appears.

*The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians.* By G. G. FINDLAY, D.D. 'Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges.' (Cambridge : University Press.) Price 3s. net.

THIS is substantially a new work intended for the Greek student, and is marked by the completeness, and knowledge of St. Paul's thought, of which Dr. Findlay has before given proof. The textual notes are full, and offer real guidance in settling the merits of readings ; the exegetical notes are very complete—in truth, at times somewhat wordy and overloaded.

From the Introduction (pp. xv., xxvii.) we learn incidentally that Dr. Findlay still believes that the Galatian letter was addressed to the Churches of N. Galatia, which were established by St. Paul on his second journey ; and he consequently allows a somewhat longer interval before the arrival at Thessalonica than is now generally granted ; at the same time he has been led to date these Epistles two years earlier than in his former work.

The authorship of the Second Epistle Dr. Findlay is inclined to divide between St. Paul and Silas, regarding the latter as 'the actual composer' of the large portions which are more or less parallel to the First Epistle, and which seem to him wanting in spontaneity and freshness. Silas is named as being St. Paul's coadjutor and an inspired prophet. The notes, however, are all written from the standpoint of Pauline authorship (e.g. contrast lvii. line 8 from end with p. 143, top). On the much-disputed passage in the Second Epistle there is a long Appendix, in addition to twenty pages of notes. The attempt to limit St. Paul's language to the events of his own time is deprecated. Dr. Findlay fully admits that the Cæsar worship of the age was in the Apostle's mind, but also argues for understanding by ὁ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ the Christian community, and so treats the passage as prophetic for all ages, and approves (p. 231) the various historical fulfilments which have been seen from time to time in St. Paul's words.

## II.—MISSIONS.

*The Church in Madras.* By the Rev. FRANK PENNY, LL.M. 21s. net. (London : Messrs. Smith, Elder & Co., 1904.)

THIS large volume seems to be best described by its author's inscription—'To the memory of the Honourable East India Company, this record of their ecclesiastical policy and action is most respectfully dedicated.' It was certainly time that this important subject should be taken up in earnest and in an historic spirit. Hitherto it has been practically neglected, with the result that the Company's reputation

VOL. LXI.—NO. CXXI.

P



has suffered grievously, and the faults of particular periods and individuals have been treated as typical of their entire history. The author displays, and emphasizes as they deserve, not only the continuously religious policy of the Directors in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and to a certain extent even afterwards, but also the fact that their servants in India steadily urged them forward in the right paths, not least when they themselves were disposed to halt or hesitate. Historical truth, not literary merit, is Mr. Penny's object, consequently his book is a vast mass of facts, illustrated perpetually by the unanswerable evidence of original documents, quoted at length.

The book is certainly not one for the general reader: but it is indispensable to the future narrator of England's work in India, even from the political, much more from the religious, point of view. Historians of Indian Missions, who (we fear it must be confessed) have till now been too severe on the East India Company, must form their judgements hereafter in the light of Mr. Penny's work. Unhappy incidents did indeed occur, notably the Company's slackness in appointing chaplains for the King's soldiers in India between 1760 and 1796, and the general attitude of the Directors towards missions and missionaries between 1792 and 1813; but this latter was partly provoked by the unwise attempt to *compel* the Company to prosecute the work *officially*—an attempt too often overlooked in these days; and despite the false position in which the Directors landed themselves, Mr. Penny is just when he says (p. 499) 'when they [the Company's opponents] were successful in getting a clause inserted in the new charter<sup>1</sup> compelling the Company to permit missionaries to go to India, to reside under their protection, and to carry out their purposes of instruction and conversion, who ever would have guessed that this same Company had not only been permitting missionaries to go to India for eighty years past, but had also paid their passage money and carried their baggage and books and printing presses and stores and remittances in silver freight free?' Mr. Penny's work abounds in weighty sentences of this kind, virtual summaries of the results of many laboriously written pages: this is the more fortunate, as owing to the multiplicity of its subjects the book at times inevitably wears the appearance of confusion. The author brings out repeatedly the devotion of the Lutheran missionaries employed by the S.P.C.K. Not only the great Schwartz, but the saintly Gericke, the earnest though less gifted Ziegenbalg, Grundler, Hutteman, Rottler, Pohle, and many others—even the unfortunate Fabricius—have full justice

<sup>1</sup> That of 1813.



done them; not only their success among the heathen, but their preservation of the European troops from utter godlessness during the years of neglect by the Company, are constantly alluded to. Among other matters of interest which deserve mention are the wise, and generally liberal, conduct of the Company to Roman Catholics in India, and their generosity in assisting to found schools for European and Eurasian children.

*A Yankee on the Yangtze.* Being a narrative of a journey from Shanghai through the Central Kingdom to Burma. By WILLIAM EDGAR GEIL. With one hundred full-page illustrations. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1904.) Price 6s.

THIS book is a narrative by an American writer of a journey across China recently made by himself, at first by steamer up the Yangtze, then overland through the Far Western provinces southward to Burma. The author is a warm friend of missionaries and missionary work, and one main object of his journey was to inspect that work with his own eyes; thus throughout the book it is given a prominent place, and in almost every city through which he passed one of his first recorded actions was to visit the missionary agency or agencies there stationed. How unlike the conduct of the average traveller, whether in China or elsewhere! We commend the book to all fair-minded laymen, for a picture of the good work which should appeal specially to them, being at once discriminating, and distinctly from a layman's standpoint: e.g. the *financial* management of the Missions—notably of the China Inland Mission, which helped to forward him on his journey—draws forth his warm praise; 'never have I seen money go so far in accomplishing the purpose for which it was given.' Many a prejudice spread by careless or unscrupulous writers (on whom the author is very severe) will be dispelled by this book; the picture of entire Chinese villages and clans inquiring after the Gospel will cheer all who are already interested in the work, while the necessity for that work is emphasized by the kindly but firm manner in which the writer exposes Chinese superstitions. As to the literary merits of the book, opinions will probably differ. It is in fact a diary, often (to all appearance) hastily written; it would bear curtailment in many places; repetitions are frequent, and details sometimes trivial. But the light, conversational style makes these defects less evident; and the descriptions of Chinese customs and scenery are life-like and agreeable. Among the most interesting passages are the account of the Great Examination Hall at Nanking, of the interview with the enlightened Viceroy, Tuan Fang, and of

the entire journey across the mountain province of Yunnan, 'the Switzerland of China.' The illustrations are clear, bright, and for the most part eminently useful; this however brings out more strongly the great need of the whole—a map of the Chinese Empire, or at least of those provinces through which the writer travelled. Vivid as the narrative is, it would be more vivid still could this omission be supplied.

*For Christ in Fuh-Kien.* Being a new edition (the fourth) of the story of the Fuh-Kien Mission of the Church Missionary Society. (London: C.M.S., Salisbury Square, E.C., 1904.) Price 2s. 6d. net.

THIS work, the official account by the C.M.S. of one of their principal missions in China, was originally composed by Mr. Eugene Stock, in 1877; second and third editions appeared in 1882 and 1890. Since the latter date the Mission has so widely developed (the mere number of its converts having more than doubled, apart from its growth in other respects) that it has now been necessary almost to rewrite the book; this has been done by the Rev. T. McClelland, himself a missionary in Fuh-Kien from 1890 to 1896. Fuh-Kien, a relatively small province in Eastern China, whose capital is the large seaport of Fuh-Chow, has been the scene of—thus far—the greatest effort made by the C.M.S. in that Empire. By no means the Society's most picturesque Mission, it has been second to none in real interest. Its record is one of fifty years' labour for Christ, at first as it seemed unrewarded, afterwards, though with many vicissitudes, successful and advancing; a tale of uphill struggle on the part of missionaries and converts alike, of incessant persecution, and in one instance of frightful massacre. All this is told in a plain, earnest manner, without exaggeration, and any good results which came of the evil are dwelt on no less than the evil itself; notably, in certain instances, the protection given by fair-minded heathen magistrates is acknowledged. In the account of the actual work, failures, and especially the backsliding of converts, are mentioned as often and related as fully as successes; certain besetting weaknesses of the Chinese Christians in the earlier years of the Mission are also candidly admitted. It is honesty of this kind in a missionary book which gives it the ring of truth, and makes us rise from it with the firm conviction that the work is indeed of God. Two useful chapters are those on 'The Ministry of Women' and 'Chinese their own Evangelists'; while the conclusion gives an effective summing-up of all the leading points.

*By Reef and Shoal.* By WILLIAM SINKER, R.N.R., Commander of the Melanesian Mission's Steamer 'Southern Cross.' (London: S.P.C.K., 1904.)

THE maiden trip of the new 'Southern Cross' among the Melanesian Islands in the autumn of 1903, related by her commander, Captain Sinker—such is this little book in a nutshell. It is the work of a keen observer of men and things, an enthusiastic seaman, and a not less enthusiastic admirer of the Mission in general and of Bishop Wilson in particular. We will not spoil its effect beforehand by giving a single detail. We heartily hope that it may be widely read, and may bring as much support to the Melanesian Mission as it will give pleasure to its readers.

*Here and There with the S.P.G. in India.* Compiled by the Rev. HERBERT MOORE. Price 1s. (London: S.P.G. House, 1905.)

THIS book is the third of its kind, being one of the popular series 'Here and There with the S.P.G.,' which the Society is engaged in publishing. It aims at giving a short, readable, and even vivid account of the leading S.P.G. Missions in India, the manners and religion of the people, the main obstacles to Christianity, the nature and difficulties of mission work, and its results up to the present time. In this aim it may fairly be said to have succeeded; and we can confidently recommend it to readers who wish for information which they would not easily find elsewhere.

*The Life and Work of E. J. Peck among the Eskimos.* By the Rev. ARTHUR LEWIS. Price 6s. (London: Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton, 1904.)

FOR pictures of the truest heroism in the mission field, quite apart from persecution, we have but to turn to the records of the C.M.S. in the frozen wastes of North America. Such a record is the work before us—the story of the Church's pioneer missionary to the Eskimo race in those regions; told partly by the author himself, partly by means of copious extracts from Mr. Peck's diary. Mr. Lewis' narrative is clear and well written; and in chapters II. and III., which are entirely his own, he gives such an account of that most interesting people, the Eskimos, as well prepares the reader for all that follows. But the main interest of the book is in Mr. Peck's own words. His simple, straightforward jottings tell us of the dangers endured by the natives, which the missionary has to share with them—the furious, persistent gales, the deadly cold, the long, frequent privations; of their cheerful disposition, their kindly

hospitality, their uncleanness and their heathen abominations ; of their willingness to listen to the Gospel, too often balanced by unwillingness to embrace its precepts. We see his affection for his flock, his tactful dealings with them, his refusal to despise the day of small things, his devotion to them in distress ; we follow with breathless interest his boat journeys among masses of drifting ice ; we await with him the arrival of the annual vessel which is to bring the coming year's provisions and news from the dear ones at home. A noble field this for the preacher of the Cross ! And the work is yet but begun.

### III.—DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY.

*Questions of Faith: a Series of Lectures on the Creed.* By Professor JAMES DENNEY, D.D. ; Professor MARCUS DODS, M.A., D.D. ; Emeritus Professor JOHN LAIDLAW, D.D. ; Principal T. M. LINDSAY, D.D. ; Professor H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.Phil. ; Professor JAMES ORR, M.A., D.D., and P. CARNEGIE SIMPSON, M.A. (London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1904.) Price 5s.

THIS collection of lectures has some special interest at a time when there is a good deal of uneasiness as to the tendency of the United Free Church in regard to the fundamental doctrines of the Faith. To any who look at it with this in mind it should be reassuring. The methods of thought and of expression are modern ; but, so far as central doctrine is concerned, the lectures shew a very earnest desire to maintain the truths of the Creeds. It is natural that in a book by Presbyterians there is very much about the Church and the Sacraments with which most instructed members of the Church of England will strongly disagree. In particular, they will regret the description of the rite of Confirmation as 'neither Scriptural nor Catholic.' The best of the lectures appear to us to be those on the Resurrection, by Dr. Marcus Dods ; on Christ as the Son of God, by Dr. H. R. Mackintosh ; and on God, by Dr. Orr. It is probable that some of the arguments in Dr. Orr's lecture will appeal less widely than he seems to expect. Professor Huxley, we think, would have treated them with impatience. But it contains very much that is valuable, and its recognition that the central question is as to the Personality of God is both right and timely. We have noticed a very odd blunder in the lecture on the Holy Spirit, by Dr. Laidlaw. The words 'proceeds from the Father and the Son' are described as having been publicly confessed at the Council of Constantinople of 381, and it is said a few pages later that 'the early Church enshrined in her *filioque*, "proceedeth from

the Father and from the Son"<sup>1</sup> the 'personal relation' of the Holy Ghost 'in the Godhead.' It is strange that Dr. Laidlaw should have forgotten the facts as to the insertion of the *Filioque* in the Creed. In the same lecture the phrase that 'the Eastern Church' has 'committed herself to the denial of' the 'connection' of the Holy Ghost 'with the Son' would naturally give a wholly wrong impression as to Eastern teaching.

*A Sacrament of Our Redemption: an Inquiry into the Meaning of the Lord's Supper in the New Testament and the Church of England.*  
By W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, B.D. (London and Derby: Bemrose and Sons.) Price 2s. 6d.

THIS is a discussion of the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist found in the New Testament and the formularies of the English Church, considered specially in relation to the teaching of some recent books on the subject, of which the most important are the Bishop of Birmingham's *The Body of Christ* and Mr. Stone's *The Holy Communion*. The general position is very much the same as that of Waterland. The book conveys the impression that the limits of the author's scholarship and reading are soon reached; but his treatment of his subject, however unconvincing, is always reverent and temperate. We have noticed an exception to his usual fairness in the passage in which it is said that the third rubric at the end of the Office for the Communion of the Sick 'proves beyond question that the presence of our Lord is independent of the elements,' and 'would have no meaning' if it were true that 'there is a special and unique presence of Christ in the elements, a special and unique adoration of our Lord at the celebration of the Communion, a special and unique sacrifice at that time, and a special and unique gift bestowed on the communicants.' Mr. Thomas can hardly be unaware that this rubric is simply an expansion of a mediæval direction—the work of those who certainly held the 'presence,' 'adoration,' 'sacrifice,' and 'gift' with which he maintains the rubric is inconsistent—in which the priest was ordered to say to a sick man for whom Communion was physically impossible, 'Frater, in hoc casu sufficit tibi vera fides et bona voluntas: tantum crede, et manducasti.'

*The Catholic Faith.* A Manual of Instruction for Members of the Church of England. By W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, B.D. (London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1905.) Price 2s. net.

THIS theological manual by Mr. Griffith Thomas seems to us to exhibit the same characteristic merits and defects as we have noticed

<sup>1</sup> The italics are Dr. Laidlaw's.

in his previous work. Where he is writing on subjects as to which there is much agreement in the Church of England a clear and easy style, methodical arrangement, and a spiritual tone make his work often useful, if not always very profound. As an instance of a passage which we have been able specially to welcome, we may mention the reference to the spiritual loss which results from allowing too little prominence in Christian thought to our Lord's Ascension. But when Mr. Thomas passes these limits the merits to which we have referred do not compensate for very serious blemishes. As he becomes more controversial the lack of historical grasp, which betrays itself throughout the book, is more manifest; and he commits himself to theological positions as to which we doubt whether he has at all adequately thought out the consequences. Thus we have constantly found ourselves, not only disagreeing with the book, but feeling it to be poor and wanting competence. A few instances out of many we have noted may help to make our meaning clear. When Mr. Thomas makes the truth of the statement that in Baptism an infant is made 'a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven' to depend on, among other things, 'the sincerity of the godparents in their coming, and in their prayers and promises during the service,' he appears to adopt a view which is contradictory of, to say no more, the principles assumed in the Church of England Office for the Ministration of Private Baptism of Children in Houses. His teaching on final perseverance seems to us in complete opposition to the facts involved in the reality of probation while life lasts, and in the gradual character of the spiritual growth of those who have become the servants of God. The prohibition of art as an aid to worship cannot rightly be said to be part of the meaning of the Second Commandment for Christians. It is surely perverse to say that at the Holy Communion the alms are a sacrifice but the elements are not. It is a misinterpretation of the fifth rubric after the Order of Holy Communion to say that it prescribes that the bread 'should be "such as is used to be eaten."' The words of the Prayer Book are: 'It shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten'; and there is good historical ground for understanding the words 'it shall suffice' in their natural sense, as allowing, but not ordering, the use of ordinary bread. To Mr. Thomas' interpretation of the third rubric at the end of the Office for the Communion of the Sick we have referred in our notice of his previous work, where it also appears. The statements about the Articles of Religion do not allow for their being articles of peace, which aimed at the inclusion in the National Church of men who differed much



on many matters. In particular, the contention that members of the Church of England are bound to Calvin's doctrine of the Eucharist is hopelessly unhistorical. When Mr. Thomas says that 'the practice of prayers for the dead falls to the ground' 'with the rejection of' 'the Roman Catholic theory of purgatory,' we wish to ask him whether he supposes that, for instance, St. Cyril of Jerusalem and St. Chrysostom held 'the Roman Catholic theory of purgatory.'

It is a matter for some satisfaction that Mr. Thomas thinks himself free to reject the interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric which was adopted by the courts of law in the *Purchas and Ridsdale Judgements*; but the interpretation which he prefers appears to us still more preposterous. That the revisers of the Prayer Book in 1661 should enact that certain ornaments should 'be retained and be in use,' with the meaning that these ornaments should be kept and be in trust—that is, not appropriated by any private persons—until a royal visitation in the reign of Elizabeth, is too absurd. It should be remembered that the alteration in the wording of the Ornaments Rubric by the revisers of 1661 shews that it was deliberately and thoughtfully retained by them as an operative provision. We do not think that in this book Mr. Thomas is ever intentionally unfair; we do think that in writing it he has undertaken a task for which his knowledge and intellectual grasp are not adequate.

*The Word and Sacraments, and other Papers Illustrative of Present Questions on Church Ministry and Worship.* By THOMAS DEHANY BERNARD, M.A., Prebendary and Chancellor of Wells. (London and Derby: Bemrose and Sons, 1904.) Price 3s. 6d.

THE theological tone of these papers may be guessed, apart from other knowledge of their respected author, from the facts that some of them appeared in the *Ladies' League Gazette*, and that the substance of one of them was given in an address at the Islington meeting of clergy. They may be welcomed as affording a quiet and thoughtful presentation of positions, extreme forms of which have of late too frequently been expressed with much intemperance. Without attempting any detailed criticism, we may observe that the opinion that the usual words of administration of Baptism were not employed till the end of the first or the beginning of the second century is highly precarious, and that a writer with actual knowledge of the system and methods of—let us say—Wells, Ely, and Cuddesdon, and



of representative men on entering and leaving those colleges, would hardly have written

‘Men pass from . . . our theological colleges . . . into holy orders equipped rather for propounding adopted ideas or carrying out ritual systems than for the cure of souls, which has to deal with the duties and difficulties, the trials and temptations, the conflicts and sorrows, of actual life.’

#### IV.—PRACTICAL AND DEVOTIONAL THEOLOGY.

*The Christian Opportunity.* By the ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. (London: Macmillan, 1904.) Price 3s. 6d.

THIS is the collected volume of the sermons and speeches delivered by the Archbishop during his recent tour in America, when, for the first time, a successor of St. Augustine visited in person the great daughter Churches across the Atlantic, which look with grateful and filial love to the Mother Church of England. The visit was full of the most intense historic and spiritual interest. The audiences varied from the General Convention of the Church of the United States to an audience composed of the *litterati* of Boston in the famous Faneuil Hall, from the great meeting of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew to a huge open-air mass meeting at Washington.

The addresses are full of that healthy optimism which is so characteristic of all the Primate's utterances. We have been told that the Americans were disappointed with his rhetorical powers, but they must have been deeply impressed by the sober restraint of his words. He appears deliberately to have set before himself the difficult task of delivering once more, with all the weight of his high office, with a quiet dignity and with no rhetorical flights, certain simple points, which certainly require repetition in these hurrying days. He has succeeded in doing this, and we think that his weighty words will have a permanent effect both on the religion of America and on the relations of the great English-speaking nations on either side of the Atlantic.

*God's Board: a Series of Communion Addresses.* By E. W. BENSON, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury. (London: Methuen, n.d.) Price 3s. 6d. net.

THIS series of short addresses for every Sunday in the year has been compiled by Miss Benson from her father's unpublished sermons. Some of them have been given as he wrote them, and others are but extracts from longer addresses.

It has often been pointed out that it is much harder to preach

good short sermons than long ones, and here we have examples of what a good short sermon ought to be—some of them can only have taken two or three minutes in delivery. There is in them the chaste diction, the lofty thought, and deep devotion which were characteristics of the longer sermons of the Archbishop. But we wish that Miss Benson could have given us more of her father's work on that holy subject suggested by the title of her collection. There are only two addresses specifically on the Holy Communion, and we can find only seven or eight allusions to it in the remaining sixty-six. The book will probably be most useful when used as a help to meditation before or after Communion.

We quote a short passage from the address for the Sixth Sunday after the Epiphany, delivered on the occasion of a first Communion at Wellington College :

‘While we attend this outer feast before us, there is a spiritual communion which underlies it to which we are bidden. We are here ; are our souls also gathering this hour round the Heavenly Table, which is invisible? Are we accepting the invitation in spirit and in truth? Are our very souls presenting themselves in the Palace of the King, awaiting the gift of the Hidden Manna ?

‘We have had—we have received in person, the invitation to higher life, nearer intercourse with God, received and accepted it. Now all things are ready ; come in the body, come in the spirit ; make the sacrifice ; let not the business of life, which is necessary, nor the pleasure of life, which is God's gift also, keep you from hours in which neither business nor worldly pleasure shall mingle, in which you will see God and sit at His Table.’

*A Litany of Remembrance, Compiled for Retreats and Quiet Days for his Clergy.* By the Rt. Rev. GEORGE RIDDING, D.D., First Bishop of Southwell. With a Preface by the BISHOP OF DERBY. (London and Derby : Bemrose and Son. 1905.)

In our last number we reviewed the life of the first Bishop of Southwell. We are glad to be able now to call attention to an exceedingly characteristic and valuable book of devotion, which has been printed since his death. How often have we not been offended and irritated by the unreality of books of devotion, which have put before us an ideal which we did not desire to attain to, and felt was a most imperfect representation of Christianity ; which have warned us against faults that hardly seemed to us were faults, and have incited us to virtues which seemed almost failings ; which at their best have breathed the spirit of the cloister rather than reflected the conflict of the Christian soldier !

In marked contrast to these, this *Litany of Remembrance* is the work of a strong masculine intellect, which has aimed at analyzing the real faults and failings and weaknesses of the clergy. How true to our experience is the following petition !

'In times of doubt and questionings, when our belief is perplexed by new learning . . . give us the faithfulness of learners and the courage of believers in Thee ; give us boldness to examine and faith to trust all truth ; patience and insight to master difficulties ; stability to hold fast our tradition . . . to grasp new knowledge really, and to combine it loyally and honestly with the old : alike from stubborn rejection of new revelations and from hasty assurance that we are wiser than our fathers, save us,' etc.

And this :

'From strife and partizanship and division among the brethren, from magnifying our certainties to condemn all differences, from magnifying our office and system for worldly interest and policy, from all arrogance in our dealings with all men as ministers of God.'

We cordially hope that many clergy will use this Litany as a guide to their devotions and self-examination.

*Amor Ordinatus.* Essays and Addresses. By the late ALFRED GURNEY, Vicar of St. Barnabas, Pimlico. Edited by his Sister, with the help of HERBERT H. JEAFFRESON. (London : Skeffington and Son. 1905.) Price 2s. 6d. net.

THE publication of the essays and addresses which have been collected under the title *Amor Ordinatus* will be welcomed by the many friends of the late Mr. Alfred Gurney. Mr. Gurney could hardly be considered either a scholar or a theologian ; but a singular charm and beauty of thought was among the elements of his attractive character, and those who had the privilege of his friendship or were helped by his ministry will find much in this little volume which will recall him to their minds. And even among those who did not know the author, these papers may have interest and value for any whose insight and temperament enable them to enter into the spirit with which they were written.

*Christian and Catholic.* By the Right Reverend CHARLES C. GRAFTON, S.T.D., Bishop of Fond du Lac. (New York and London : Longmans. 1905.) Price 7s. 6d. net.

THIS book contains much that is beautiful which will be useful to the devout people for whom the author probably has chiefly written. In spite of its obvious earnestness and its spiritual tone, we doubt

whether it has the qualities by which to help those who are puzzled or are still seeking for the truth. A protest is needed against the statements, possibly due to experience of an unworthy type of proselytizing, that for an Anglican to become a Roman Catholic is 'the most presumptuous sin,' 'the most terrible spiritual sin' 'a Christian man can commit'; since those in view do not appear to be simply any who act lightly, but also those who because of real conviction could not with a good conscience remain outside the Church of Rome.

#### V.—CHURCH HISTORY.

*Church and State in England.* By W. H. ABRAHAM, D.D.  
(London : Longmans. 1905.) Price 5s.

At the present time few books are more needed for the understanding of Church questions than a wise and well-informed examination of the relations between Church and State. It was therefore natural that Canon Newbolt and Mr. Stone should include such a volume in the 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology.' Dr. Abraham's book will no doubt be widely read, and by its clear, sound views may cause a wider appreciation among the public of the essential features of past history and present needs. It is written, markedly, in a way to attract attention. Each sentence, almost, is a paragraph, and the meaning of each proposition, no less than the meaning of the book as a whole, is plain to the most casual reader. The study is fair-minded as well as lucid, and if it is not legal in tone is not aggressively ecclesiastical; it is, as it should be, rather constitutional.

The best part of the book is undoubtedly the excellent summary of the case for and against Disestablishment. This is calmly written—though not without trace of suppressed feeling—and very thoughtfully and completely also. We would strongly advise those who have decided views on either side to read these pages. Their conclusion is a wise, and in the best sense an historical, one; but whether it has any chance of being carried into effect is another question.

Having said so much in favour of the book, we are compelled to add that it seems to us to have not a few faults in detail. In general we would gladly, and may candidly, praise it; though we cannot but regard it as a great opportunity missed when we discover that it is written almost entirely from secondary (and some of them quite obsolete) sources, and without the exact references which would have so largely increased its value. But in detail it needs continual

correction ; and we call attention to this, because we hope that the interest of the subject may win for the book a second edition, and thus the opportunity may recur of producing a book really valuable and useful for the Church and the public. A few instances may be cited. It is a mistake to connect the need of Church reform in the time of More and Fisher in any way with 'the turmoil of the Wars of the Roses' ; we might as well connect the Methodist movement with the South Sea Bubble. Surely it is late in the day to agree with Macaulay's ignorant epigram that a Christian of the fifth century with a Bible is neither better nor worse situated than a Christian of the nineteenth century—late if the writer has any understanding of the mission of the Church. The exaggeration that a large part of the country was evangelized from Iona may perhaps be passed by, but what shall we say of the utterly unwarrantable statement that under the Norman kings 'the bishoprics were converted into feudal tenures,' save that it is one of those gross blunders which do so much to perpetuate ignorance as to the history of the English Church? Dr. Abraham is right in his account of the compromise between Henry I. and Anselm, but he does not explain why it is that bishops now do homage *after* consecration. It is rash indeed to assert (on no better authority, too, than that of Dean Hook) that 'in the hundred court the rural dean and headborough' were co-ordinate ; still more rash to declare that the spiritual courts could only inflict penance, suspension, or excommunication ; and quite incorrect to maintain that Henry II. wished clerks found guilty in the Church courts to be tried again by a civil court. 'The people,' we now know well enough, had no share at all in Magna Carta. The bishops were not 'organised,' or summoned to Parliament 'as feudal barons.' Much, indeed, of what Dr. Abraham writes seems to be vitiated by an unconscious confusion between the position of the clergy in Convocation and in Parliament ; he appears, for example, to cite the 1295 writ of summons to Parliament as a summons to Convocation, which was quite a different thing. The Reformation period is well summarized, but it need hardly be stated that Rapin is no authority at all for the treatment of Romanists under Elizabeth. The mistaken assertion that Mainwaring threatened those who would not pay the unsanctioned loans with 'eternal damnation' should surely not be repeated nowadays ; nor, an assertion of quite different bearing, that Parliament has no constitutional right to the powers it exercises over the Church ; or another, as mischievous as it is erroneous, that the bishops sit in the House of Lords as barons. But the most unfortunate mistake, and most vital to the whole book, is that when the position of the canon law in England is discussed

the work of Professor Maitland is entirely ignored. It may be true that 'foreign canon law was never received in its entirety in the kingdom, but only such parts of it as applied to our own needs,' but it is a view quite contrary to the most thorough investigation which the subject has at present received. We ourselves believe that Dr. Abraham's position can be maintained, but to assert it dogmatically, without a word of explanation or proof, and without so much as mention of Dr. Maitland's famous book, is really inexcusable in a work which professes to deal seriously with the historical position of the Church in England. Happily these defects are not essential to the structure of the book. They can be remedied, and we heartily hope they will be.

#### VI.—BIOGRAPHY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

*The Life of Major-General Wauchope, C.B., C.M.G., LL.D.* By Sir GEORGE DOUGLAS, Bart. With three Portraits in Photogravure. Price 10s. 6d. (London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1904.)

VERY rarely indeed does it fall to the lot of any biographer to record the career of so perfect a character—'sans peur et sans reproche'—as Major-General Andrew Wauchope, and admirably has Sir George Douglas taken advantage of his splendid opportunity. The 'Life' before us follows the development from his cradle to his grave of one of the most energetic and unselfish men that ever wore the Highland uniform, of one who 'combined, with the best qualities proper to the soldier, the genius of goodness and lovingkindness, of a unique and inspiring personality.' From a literary standpoint the task has been accomplished with exceptional skill. Sir George Douglas never overburdens his pages with superfluous details or irrelevant matter, as the manner of some is, while he gives us enough to furnish a vivid character-sketch in each period in a very varied experience, which included the Ashanti campaign and the first war in the Transvaal, the Egyptian expedition of 1882 and that for the relief of General Gordon, the command of a brigade in the Soudan under Lord Kitchener and employment in the Boer War under Lord Methuen until Wauchope's too early death at Magersfontein. These military duties were interspersed with the appointment to a Commissionership in Cyprus under Sir Garnet Wolseley, when we took possession of the island, and with a long and arduous canvass of Midlothian in opposition to Mr. Gladstone, whose great majority of 4,000 he succeeded in reducing in 1892 to 690—a notable triumph, since Mr. Morley asserts that the great Liberal leader had put forth every atom

of his strength in the contest. It was entirely in keeping with Wauchope's whole nature that this most unequal struggle against the most powerful antagonist in England was accepted with the completest comprehension of its difficulty and in a spirit of the sincerest self-depreciation.

'You took me,' he said, at a great gathering after the election, 'like you take your wife, for better or for worse, and as the days went on you found that I was not afraid to do some work. And we had a grand cause, we had a great cause—ah! and more than that, we had a holy cause to fight for. We fought mainly and chiefly for the maintenance of the Union, and we fought for the maintenance of the old historic Church of Scotland.'

Two brief extracts from Wauchope's letters to his wife may serve as a self-revelation of the staunchness, the devotion to duty, and the deep personal piety of the writer. Speaking of the regimental accounts, he says:

'You see I run a great big shop, and I am one of those people who will do things for themselves, and really, if one doesn't, things never go right. . . . God Almighty never meant people to spend much on themselves, I am sure of that. The Gospel of Jesus Christ meant one to live plain, means us to live plain, and be humble and not caring for the great—by that I mean bowing to wealth and those who can give to one, I am a Tory and yet I am a Democrat. My father and those who were before him were the same.' (P. 304.)

'The more I have to do with men the more sure I am of this—that example is *the* thing. You may talk till you're blue in the face, but if you want to be followed you must lead. . . . I like being in the middle of the men—it is a glorious feeling to lead men in a hot corner if they will follow. Oh yes, I like also doing what I am told. . . . The country we call our own is a great one—the Union Jack is a noble flag . . . but I must stop. I am in the service, but I feel it all, and it makes my blood run fast.' (*Ib.*)

These two brief extracts are eminently typical of a highly lovable and fascinating personality.

*The Life of Margaret Godolphin.* By JOHN EVELYN. 'The King's Classics.' (Alexander Moring, Limited: De La More Press, 1904.) Price 2s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR GOLLANCZ has been well advised in adding to the delightful series of publications which he has already provided for the lovers of fine literature this careful edition of a lesser English classic. The peculiar charm attaching to the records of a memorable group of spiritually minded Englishwomen—'beautiful souls' they



would have been called in a different age and land—whose lives belong mainly to the later years of the seventeenth century, is familiar to all students of our national biography. In part this charm is, of course, due to the contrast between chaste and noble lives and the naughty world around them. But the pietistic tendencies fostered by the very sense of conflict—tendencies which were in consequence shared by women of all shades of ecclesiastical opinion—were allied to the more detached, and, therefore, for the meditative mind, more enduringly attractive, aspirations of earlier and less complicated ages. Thus the interest of such a biography as Margaret Godolphin's transcends that of the antithesis between herself and her surroundings. Evelyn, who composed the narrative as a labour of love, was in his turn an amalgam of traditional Royalist sentiment and ineradicable Puritan conviction. The laboured efflorescence of the diction of his monograph, though nowhere obscuring the sentiment with which it is instinct, betrays the half-antiquated influence of the school of Donne; and the record of the compact of inviolable friendship between the writer and the 'excellent creature' to whom he 'solemnly engaged' himself savours of the 'Platonic' supra-sensualism of the earlier Caroline age. On the other hand, nothing but a half-playful, half-serious grafting of Puritan upon Anglican sentiment could have suggested the uncomfortable conceit that little Margaret Blagge's opposition against Queen Henrietta Maria's attempts to make her attend Mass at Paris constituted her 'a Confessor and almost a Martyr before she was seven years old.'

Yet, after all, the necessarily slight materials which Evelyn possessed for his account of a life which ended at twenty-six were handled by him with so rare a tenderness that the dew still seems to linger on the beautiful flower that knew no noontide. It was a strange fate which, after a course of true love which had run anything but smoothly, mated so spiritual a being with one by profession a politician and a placeman; but there are no more pathetic pages in this book than the paper which, 'as if presaging what was at hand,' she wrote for her husband's eyes; and her death left him heartbroken. Though her years had been few, they had been full. Soon after her confirmation by good Bishop Gunning of Ely, at the early age of eleven she was named maid of honour to poor Ann Hyde, of whose desolate death her young attendant has a touching note: 'none remembered her after one week; none sorry for her.' But it needed no such warning to wean Margaret Blagge from the influences of her surroundings. From what was evil this Una shrank instinctively. 'Avoid those people;' she writes in her *Diary*; 'when I come into

the drawing-room, be sure never to talk to the King.' And yet the sweet simplicity of her manner at times expanded into the most attractive gaiety: 'tis hardly to be imagined,' says the sedate Evelyn, 'the talent she peculiarly had in repeating a comical part or acting in it, when in a cheerful humour and amongst particular friends she would sometimes divert them. . . . Certainly she was the most harmless and diverting creature in nature.'

After she had for some time served as maid of honour to Queen Catharine, she received the permission she had long desired to retire from the Court, though she was brought back there against her will on the memorable occasion on which she played a part in the masque of *Calisto*. Soon after she was united to the husband of her choice and accompanied him to Paris, where she had to bear as best she could with the empty life of fashion—talk and cards, and cards and 'prate' again. On their return home they settled near Scotland Yard, on the bank of the Thames, where she could at last possess her soul in quiet and enjoy the freedom she prized—that of a peaceful, virtuous, and charitable life. 'Nothing in this world had she more to wish but what God soon afterwards gave her, that she might be mother of a child.' In the fourth year of her married life she gave birth to a son, and a few days afterwards she died.

We may end with another extract from her *Diary*. It is quite commonplace, and its substance may recur in a hundred diaries of the present day (if such things are still kept). But something of the charm of the writer, as well as of her spirit, seems still to breathe from the simple lines:

'I will never play this half year but at threepenny ombre, and then with one at halves. I will not; I do not vow, but I will not do it,—what, lose money at cards, yet not give to the poor? It is robbing God, mispending time, and misemploying my talent: three great sins! Three pounds would have kept three people from starving a month: well, I will not play.'

*Chatham.* By FREDERIC HARRISON. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1905.) Price 2s. 6d.

THE last place in the gallery of 'Twelve English Statesmen,' long ago allotted to the portrait of Lord Chatham, has hitherto remained vacant for want of an artist to paint the picture: if rumours are true, more than one distinguished man of letters undertook and subsequently relinquished the task, which has at last been entrusted to the practised hand of Mr. F. Harrison. It is not wonderful that some difficulty has been found in getting anyone to write a short biography of the elder Pitt—a man who touches our century so very nearly in some of its ideals, and who is yet so far from it in his

methods of working for them ; in whom there are so many things that everyone can understand, and with which men of all shades of politics can now agree, and yet so much of what is merely repellent to the educated opinion of our own day.

By force of sheer genius Chatham escaped being vulgar ; yet, had he not been grounded upon classical literature and high standards of taste, had he in short lived as a statesman in the twentieth century, there would have been an undoubted danger of his becoming vulgar : in the eighteenth century reticence was not necessary to escape degradation ; in the twentieth it is. Mr. Harrison may, we think, be considered to have succeeded in his task, and this is the more creditable to him from the fact that he is avowedly out of sympathy with the modern version of Chatham's imperial idea. He has made the best of the extremely difficult task of trying to prove that Chatham would have rejected modern 'imperialism' altogether : and it must be admitted that the last years of the statesman's life, the treatment of which forms much the best part of this book, go far to prove his point. But Pitt in Opposition, whether at the beginning or the end of his life, was a very different person from Pitt at the height of his power during the Seven Years' War ; and his biographer is obliged to own that the humiliation of the House of Bourbon, on which that great heart was set, might, had his lease of power been longer, have been carried a great deal too far in the direction of that modern imperialism which is such a bugbear to some worthy people to-day. But we think that an ordinary reader will do more justice to the eighteenth century if he frankly admits that the views of all its greatest statesmen were practically the same—the exaltation of their own country at the expense of others. Marlborough, Carteret, Chatham, Pitt the younger, and Castlereagh, all aspired to put their country in a position in which it would be able to dictate terms to every other country in every quarter of the globe. Mr. Harrison would no doubt call this a 'bad eminence,' and there certainly have been nations that have been unable to use great eminence with moderation ; but it must be remembered, in defence of Chatham, that when Great Britain came nearest to attaining such a position, *e.g.* in 1713, 1763, and 1815, she used her victory with studied self-restraint. The fact that the 'Great Commoner' seriously contemplated such a position renders his career of perennial interest to his countrymen.

In giving due praise to Mr. Harrison's book as that of a practised veteran in the field of letters, we must not be understood to say that there is anything new or any evidence of research in it. It is such a book as a man who was moderately well read forty years ago could well have produced if he possessed Mr. Harrison's pen-craft. Mr.

Harrison has the additional advantage of the *Dictionary of National Biography* to keep him straight. Macaulay's Essays and Horace Walpole's Letters afford the quotations and the *sauce piquante*: all the old stories are served up, and it is right that they should be. The style is excellent, though there is one bad slip in grammar on p. 224. One may take exception to such expressions as 'the lofty bearing of the *vieille cour* of Kensington and Versailles' (Lord Hervey and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu fail to leave on one the impression that the bearing of the court of the first two Georges was particularly 'lofty'). It would be the upper school, not the lower, that 'cowered before the inexorable Dr. Keate.' Lower-school boys of those days had their own terror in the Lower Master. These, however, are trifles: it is a more serious matter that one looks in vain for any trace that Mr. Harrison has reconsidered in the light of recent evidence the position of some of the best-abused of Chatham's contemporaries. Newcastle is still the inept old jobber that Macaulay left him; Grafton (though we are happily spared Nancy Parsons) the easy-going optimist; while, stranger still, Carteret, the real precursor of so many of Chatham's ideals, whom he so splendidly acknowledged in after life as his instructor in statesmanship, is still the 'man of vapouring ambition,' the 'extinct volcano,' 'the drunkard.' When Mr. Harrison says that what ought to have been done (in 1744) was to bring about a reconciliation between the princes of Germany (p. 48), he forgets that it is exactly what Carteret was trying to do. Carteret failed, as we all know, because he was too lofty to use the Newcastle brand of grease for oiling the wheels of the Parliamentary machine, which Pitt was at last reluctantly compelled to stoop to use.

Against this we have only to set the acuteness with which Mr. Harrison has put his finger on the criminality of Charles Townshend and the really clever manner in which he explains the hostility of Burke to the dying Chatham.

#### PERIODICALS.

*The Journal of Theological Studies* (Vol. VI. No. 24. July 1905. H. Frowde). F. H. Chase: 'The Lord's Command to Baptize (Matt. xxviii. 19).' 'The authorship of the *Contra Marcellum* and the *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*,' by Dr. Chase and Mr. Bethune-Baker. Dom Connolly: 'Aphraates and Monasticism.' W. Sanday: 'Adam Storey Farrar.' M. R. James: 'The Acts of Titus and the Acts of Paul.' W. E. Barnes: 'The Ten Words of Exodus xxxiv.' Dom Chapman: 'St. Irenæus on the Dates of the Gospels.' J. B. Mayor: 'The Epistle of St. Jude and the Marcosian Heresy.' M. R. James: 'Lacau, *Fragments d'Apocryphes Coptes*.' Dom Butler: 'The so-called *Tractatus Origenis* and other Writings attributed to Novatian.' A. S. Walpole: 'Hymns attributed to Hilary of Poitiers.' H. M. Bannister: 'An Ancient Office for Holy Saturday.' From MS. Vat. Urb. Lat. 602. F. C. Conybeare: 'The Idea of Sleep

in the "Hymn of the Soul." E. Nestle and J. F. Bethune-Baker: 'The Cambridge LXX of 1665 and 1684: A Bibliographical Query.' Reviews. H. B. Swete: 'Sanday, *Outlines of the Life of Christ*.' W. Lock: 'Resch, *Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu*.' J. F. Bethune-Baker: 'Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea*.' Tixeront, *Histoire des Dogmes*, I.'; J. H. Srawley: 'Tymms, *The Christian Idea of Atonement*.' C. H. W. Johns: 'Harper, *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters*, VIII.'; M. Jastrow, jun., *Die Religion Babylonien und Assyriens*.'

*The Expositor* (Nos. LXVII.-LXIX. July-September 1905. Hodder and Stoughton). G. A. Smith: 'Isaiah's Jerusalem.' W. O. E. Oesterley: 'The Study of the Synoptic Gospels exemplified by Matt. v. 21-2.' A. R. Eagar: 'The Greater Sin: a Note on St. John xix. 11.' F. W. Lewis: 'The Suffering of God.' Dom J. Chapman: 'The Original Contents of Codex Bezae.' B. Whiteford: 'New Testament Teaching on Lawlessness.' G. Jackson: 'The Ethical Teaching of St. Paul: (7) The Ethics of Speech; (8, September) Asceticism True and False.' J. Moffatt: 'Literary Illustrations of the Book of Daniel' (*continued*). August. W. M. Ramsay: 'The Worship of the Virgin Mary at Ephesus' (*continued*). G. Milligan: 'The Eschatology of II. Thess. ii. 1-12.' Dom J. Chapman: 'The Earliest New Testament.' W. H. Bennett: 'The Life of Christ according to St. Mark' (*continued*). M. Kaufmann: 'Is the New Testament Teaching Optimistic?' W. M. Flinders Petrie: 'The Census of the Israelites' (with a Note, September). A. Carr: 'The Meaning of "Hatred" in the New Testament.' Based on Matt. x. 34-9, Luke xiv. 25-6. September. J. Rendel Harris: '"Spoken by Jeremy the Prophet."' Dean J. H. Bernard: 'Authority and Infallibility.' W. M. Ramsay: 'Iconium.' G. A. Smith: 'Sennacherib and Jerusalem, 705-681 B.C.' C. A. Scott: 'The Sufferings of Christ: A Note on 1 Pet. i. 11.'

*The Hibbert Journal* (Vol. III. No. 4. July 1905. Williams and Norgate). C. G. Montefiore: 'The Synoptic Gospels and the Jewish Consciousness.' Interesting. G. M. Trevelyan: 'Should Agnostics be Miserable?' J. Moffatt: 'Mr. Meredith on Religion.' A. C. M'Giffert: 'The God of Spinoza as interpreted by Herder.' J. A. Hutton: 'Is the Age of Faith returning?' J. M'Cabe: 'Sir Oliver Lodge on Haeckel.' H. Walker: 'The Birth of a Soul' (Oscar Wilde: the Closing Phase). T. S. Rördam: 'What was the Lost End of Mark's Gospel? A New View of the Gospel Evidence for the Resurrection.' E. Ussher: 'The Teaching of the Christian Religion in Public Schools: a Plea for Reform.' Discussions. Reviews. J. Herkless: 'A. Lang, *John Knox*.' T. K. Cheyne: 'W. R. Harper, *Amos and Hosea*.' A. E. Garvie: 'C. v. Kügelgen, *Grundriss der Ritschischen Dogmatik*.' R. R. Marett: 'Stewart, *The Myths of Plato*.' K. Lake: 'Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*.' St. G. Stock: 'A. T. Turner, *A New Morality*.'

*The American Journal of Theology* (Vol. IX. No. 3. July 1905. Chicago University Press). E. König: 'The latest Phase of the Controversy over Babylon and the Bible.' C. H. Haskins: 'The Sources for the History of the Papal Penitentiary.' Interesting, with copious authorities. B. W. Bacon: 'Jesus' Voice from Heaven.' I. W. Riley: 'The Rise of Deism in Yale College.' E. J. Goodspeed: 'The Original Conclusion of the Gospel of Mark.' A. S. Carman: 'Philo's Doctrine of the Divine Father and the Virgin Mother.' A detailed study. E. Nestle: 'The LXX. Rendering of Gen. iv. 1,' and 'Chrysostom on the Life of John the Apostle.' Reviews. 'Encyclopædia Biblica, IV.,' and 'Hastings' Dictionary, extra volume.' J. A. Bewer: 'Nöldeke, *Compendious*

*Syriac Grammar* (E. T.)'; 'F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalæstinum*'; 'J. B. Chabot, *Synodicon Orientale ou Recueil des Synodes Nestoriens* (from MS. Paris Bibl. Nat. Syr. 332 and Rom. Mus. Borg. K. VI, 4).' W. C. Allen: 'Hoffmann, *Das Marcusevangelium*; Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Matthæi*; E. de W. Burton, *Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem*; A. A. Hobson, *The Diatessaron and the Synoptic Problem*.' H. A. A. Kennedy: 'C. Clemen, *Paulus: sein Leben u. Wirken*,' and 'H. Weinel, *Paulus*.' G. B. Foster: 'Wrede, *Paulus*.' C. R. Gregory: 'D. Völter, *Die Offenbarung Johannis*'; 'A. Berendts, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Zacharias- und Johannes-Apokryphen*.' C. W. Votaw: 'W. M. Ramsay, *Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*.' H. S. Coffin: 'I. F. Wood, *The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature*.' W. R. Schoemaker: 'K. V. Lechler, *Die biblische Lehre vom heiligen Geiste*, II., III.' E. C. Richardson: 'E. C. Butler, *Lausiac History of Palladius*, II.'; 'Leipoldt, *Schenute von Atripe*'; 'Achelis-Flemming, *Die syrische Didaskalia*'; 'W. Bauer, *Der Apostolos der Syrer*'; 'Waiz, *Die Pseudoklementinen Homilien u. Rekognitionen*'; 'R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*'; 'Bonwetsch, *Drei georgisch erhaltene Schriften von Hippolytus*.' W. Muss-Arnolt: 'Klostermann, *Eusebius Onomastikon*'; 'Gressmann, *Eusebius Theophanie*'; 'Kraatz, *Koptische Akten zum Ephesinischen Konzil vom Jahre 431*'; 'E. Ter-Minassiantz, *Die Armenische Kirche bis zum Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts*.' H. C. Sheldon: 'Rosmini *Interpreted and Defended*.' J. van der Meulen: 'Cramer-Pijper, *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica*.' E. A. Cook: 'K. Heim, *Das Weltbild der Zukunft*.' G. Cross: 'Kunze, *Die ewige Gottheit Jesu Christi*,' and 'Hastie, *Theology of the Reformed Church*.' L. A. Crandall: 'Sermons and Addresses.' Notices volumes by Canons Henson and Ainger, Bp. Moule, Drs. G. H. Morrison and G. Matheson.

*The Princeton Theological Review* (Vol. III. No. 3. July 1905. Philadelphia: McCalla and Co.). J. D. Davis: 'Psalm xix. in the Criticism of the Nineteenth Century.' E. D. Warfield: 'John Knox, Reformer of a Kingdom.' J. A. Kelso: 'The Code of Hammurabi and the Book of the Covenant.' T. W. Hunt: 'The Elements of Shakespeare's Genius.' R. D. Wilson: 'Royal Titles in Antiquity, V.' T. F. Fotheringham: 'The Doctrine of Baptism in Holy Scripture and the Westminster Standards, I.' J. S. Dennis: 'Education as a National Asset of Japan.' Reviews. H. C. Minton: 'Flint, *Philosophy as Scientia Scientiarum*.' J. D. Davis: 'Muss-Arnolt, *Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language* (Assyr.-Eng.-Germ.).' G. Voss: 'Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*,' and 'J. Kögel, *Der Sohn und die Söhne* (Hebr. ii. 5-18).' T. W. Hunt: 'J. W. Bright, *The Gospel of St. Matthew and The Gospel of St. John, in West Saxon*.' H. M. Scott: 'W. Lowrie, *The Church and its Organization in Primitive and Catholic Times*.' B. B. Warfield: 'Beveridge, *Short History of the Westminster Assembly*'; 'A. Sabatier, *Doctrine of the Atonement* (E. T.); 'D. Purves, *The Life Everlasting*.' F. W. Loetscher: 'Hastie, *Theology of the Reformed Church*'; 'A. Loisy, *The Church and the Gospel* (E. T.); 'Encyclopædia of Missions.' W. B. Greene, jun.: 'H. E. Robins, *The Ethics of the Christian Life*.' W. H. Johnson: 'H. H. Wendt, *The Idea and Reality of Revelation and Typical Forms of Christianity*.' J. de Witt: 'Kellogg, *The Past a Prophecy of the Future*.' P. Martin: 'A. J. Brown, *New Forces in Old China*,' and 'Griffis, *Dux Christus*.' G. F. Greene: 'Rashdall, *Christus in Ecclesia*.' C. G. Hazard: 'D. Wortman, *The Divine Processional*.' The 'noblest modern Christian Epic.'



*The Dublin Review* (Vol. CXXXVII. No. 274. July 1905. Burns and Oates). B. C. A. Windle: 'The Form of the Human Skull, and particularly of the earliest known Skulls.' Dom J. Chapman: 'St. Athanasius and Pope Julius I.' Dom H. N. Birt: 'Religious Influences in London.' H. Pope: 'Why does the Protestant Church read the Book of Esther?' Mgr. A. S. Barnes: 'The *Acta Pilati* and the Passion Document of St. Luke.' T. J. Gerrard: 'The *Grammar of Assent* and the "Sure Future."' A. Coleman: 'The Anti-Christian Policy of the French Government.' A. B. Sharpe: '*Faciens Pacem et Creans Malum*.' Reviews. 'Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte*, II.' 'H. Leclercq, *Les Martyrs*, III.' 'J. Armitage Robinson, *Thoughts on Inspiration*.' 'Birkle-Lemaistre, *Complete and Practical Method of the Solesmes Plain-Chant*.' 'J. E. Hand, *Ideals of Science and Faith*.' 'Tixeront, *Histoire des Dogmes*, I.' 'C. Merk, *La Reine Margot et la Fin des Valois* (1553-1615).' 'M. E. Huddy, *Matilda, Countess of Tuscany*.' Unfavourable. 'R. H. Benson, *By what Authority?*' 'S. Jones, *Now and Then*.'

*The Baptist Review and Expositor* (Vol. II. No. 3. July 1905. Louisville, Ky.). H. C. Vedder: 'A Study of the Second Gospel.' H. C. Mabie: 'The Higher Rationalism.' W. T. Whitley: 'The Bible and the Church of the Euphrates.' E. M. Poteat: 'The Essence of Christianity.' J. H. Cooke: 'Some Contemporaries of Moses.' C. E. W. Dobbs: 'The Relation of the Believer to Christ.' W. R. L. Smith: 'Scholasticism, or the Evolution of the Latin Theology.' F. W. Moore: 'The Scientific Spirit.' Reviews. A. H. Newman: 'E. Caird, *The Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers*.' J. H. Farmer: 'H. B. Swete, *Studies in the Teaching of our Lord*.' A. T. Robertson: 'Sanday, *Outlines of the Life of Christ*.' J. R. Sampey: 'C. H. W. Johns, *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts, and Letters*.' W. J. McGlothlin, 'G. E. Howard, *History of Matrimonial Institutions*.' G. B. Eager: 'W. R. Harper, *Religion and the Higher Life: Talks to Students*.'

*The Jewish Quarterly Review* (Vol. XVII. No. 68. July 1905. Macmillan and Co.). R. Gottheil: 'Some Hebrew MSS. in Cairo.' With two facsimiles. D. Philipson: 'The Rabbinical Conferences, 1844-6.' G. Margoliouth: 'Gleanings from the Yemenite Liturgy.' H. Hirschfeld: 'The Arabic Portion of the Cairo Genizah at Cambridge, X.' J. H. A. Hart: 'Philo of Alexandria, I.' Begins a series summarizing Philonian writings. I. Friedländer: 'The Arabic Original of the Report of R. Nathan Hababli.' One of the Taylor-Schechter Genizah collection. M. N. Adler: 'The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela' (continued). S. A. Cook: 'Notes on Old Testament History.' II. Samuel. Reviews. W. Bacher: 'Lambert-Brandin, *Glossaire hébreu-français du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*.' H. Hirschfeld: 'L. Caetani, *Annali dell' Islām*.' I. A[brahams]: 'Bibliography of Hebraica and Judaica, March-June 1905.'

*The Expository Times* (Vol. XVI. Nos. 10-12. July-September 1905. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark). A. Lloyd: 'A Buddhist Preacher's Manual.' The *Fukyo Taikan*. J. Iverach: 'K. Sell, *Die Religion unserer Klassiker*.' Lessing, Herder, Schiller, Goethe. J. G. Tasker: 'Loofs, *Nestoriana*.' J. Taylor: 'E. Fueter, *Religion u. Kirche in England in XV. Jahrhundert*.' A. Bonus: 'An Abyssinian Christian Freethinker.' Zar'a-Ya'qob. F. Hommel: 'The Bedstead (couch) of Og of Bashan (Deut. iii. 11).' 'The bed . . . stood in the temple of Milchan at Rabbath-Ammon, and was later regarded as Og's couch or coffin.' E. Nestle: 'II. Thess. ii. 3.' J. Boehmer: 'Milk in Semitic Proper Names.' A long and interesting study. G. H. Davis: 'St. Paul's Use



of the *Jus Gentium*.' H. Smith: 'Acts xx. 8 and Luke xxii. 43.' August. R. B. Taylor: 'Messianic Prophecy.' 'Stephens, *The Child and Religion*.' Sir J. C. Hawkins, Bart.: 'The Use of Dante as an Illustrator of Scripture, II. (III. September).' 'H. Cowan, *John Knox*.' 'C. Harris, *Pro Fide*.' J. Iverach: 'E. Lucius, *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults in der christlichen Kirche*.' H. R. Mackintosh: 'O. Kirn, *Grundriss der Evangelischen Dogmatik*.' J. S. Banks: 'Luther Histories.' By Köstlin, Kawerau, and Hausrath. J. Moffatt: 'Nösgen, *Der heilige Geist*.' J. Taylor: 'Holl, *Amphilochius von Ikonium*.' H. G. Ross: 'Ps. xxii. 17.' E. Nestle: 'Matt. xxvi. 64 [W.H.] and Mark xiv. 62 [W.H.];' 'Luke vii. 47.' E. König: 'Has a New Proof of the Unity of Genesis been Discovered?' Reviews 'B. Jacob, *Der Pentateuch*.' September. A. H. M'Neile: 'The Spiritual Value of the Creation Story.' Bishop A. J. Maclean: 'Brockelmann, *Syrische Grammatik mit Paradigmen, etc.*' A. S. Geden: 'W. Geiger, *Dipavamsa und Mahāvamsa und die geschichtliche Überlieferung in Ceylon*.' W. M. Ramsay: 'The White Stone (Rev. ii. 17) and the "Gladiatorial" Tessera.' 'A. Reid, *The Principles of Heredity*.' 'G. Santayana, *The Life of Reason*.' E. König: 'The Name "Ahab."' A. Fortescue: 'H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule*.'

*The Independent Review* (Vol. VI.-VII. Nos. 22-24. July-September 1905. T. Fisher Unwin). R. Dell: 'Separation in France.' G. M. Trevelyan: 'Optimism and Mr. Meredith.' In reply to Mr. A. C. Pigou (*J.R.* May 1905). 'A Swedish Patriot': 'Sweden and Norway.' E. Jenks: 'Patriotism and Compatriotism.' C. F. G. Masterman: 'J. H. Shorthouse: *Life and Letters*.' August. D. C. Lathbury: 'Liberal Intolerance.' The Irish University Question. E. F. Bulmer: 'Rural England from Within.' G. Lowes Dickinson: 'The Newest Philosophy.' Reviews 'G. Santayana, *The Life of Reason, or the Phases of Human Progress*.' K. Suyematsu: 'Japanese Education.' G. M. Trevelyan: 'Temperley, *George Canning*.' W. J. Brown: 'A. V. Dicey, *Law and Public Opinion in England*.' R. F. Cholmeley: 'H. A. Vachell, *The Hill*.' Scathing. September. É. Combes: 'The Separation of Church and State in France.' A. Thorold: 'The English and French Churches in Fiction.' Trollope and Fabre. H. C. Bastian: 'The Origin and Development of Living Matter on the Earth.' G. M. Trevelyan: 'G. Brandes, *Naturalism in England*.'

*Edinburgh Review* (No. 413. July 1905. Longmans). 'Historical Christianity.' Reviews Harnack's *Reden und Aufsätze*. 'Painting as Thought—G. F. Watts.' 'A Modern Utopia.' Reviews Mr. H. G. Wells. 'Madame de Staël and Napoleon.' Very interesting. 'The Work of J. Henry Shorthouse.' 'Ireland under George II.' Based on the Stopford-Sackville papers. 'Bath in the Eighteenth Century.' 'The Spirit of Gothic Architecture.' 'Lord Dufferin.' Reviews Sir Alfred Lyall's Biography. 'Chatham the Reformer.'

*Quarterly Review* (No. 404. July 1905. John Murray). W. Barry: 'The School for Critics.' (The late) Bishop Creighton: 'Historical Ethics.' A valuable fragment. E. Wright: 'The Romance of the Outlands.' Studies in Novelists. A. Symons: 'The Ideas of Richard Wagner.' W. Miller: 'The Princes of the Peloponnese.' Franks and Byzantines. 'The National Coal-Supply.' 'The Study of Popular Governments, I.' Sir C. N. Eliot: 'The Buddhism of Tibet.' O. Elton: 'Recent Shakespeare Criticism.' 'The Rifle and its Use.' Important. 'Sweden and Norway.'

*The Classical Review* (Vol. XIX. No. 6. July 1905. D. Nutt). W. H. D. R[ouse]: 'Schömann-Lipsius, *Griechische Alterthümer*, II.' J. W. Mackail: 'Butcher, *Harvard Lectures on Greek Subjects*.' A. E. Housman: 'H. E. Butler, *Propertii Opera*.' A characteristic review. T. Ashby, jun.: 'Recent Excavations in Rome (*continued*).'

*The Contemporary Review* (Nos. 475-7. July-September 1905. Marshall). Sir O. Lodge: 'Some Social Reforms.' A. Ular: 'The Revival of Georgia.' W. H. Mallock: 'Through Matter to Mind.' G. S. Streatfeild: 'Christianity and Social Service: some Thoughts on the Incarnation for To-Day.' 'A Reader': 'Life and Letters of J. Henry Shorthouse.' August. P. Sabatier: 'The Evolution of Religion in France.' 'F.R.C.S.': 'Hora Mortis Nostra.' J. A. Hobson: 'Occupations of the People.' G. G. Coulton: 'The High Ancestry of Puritanism.' G. Barlow: 'The Spiritual Side of Mr. Swinburne's Genius.' H. M. Posnett: 'A Russian Seamen's Primer.' Stories of Saints. A. H. Sayce: 'Canaan in the Century before the Exodus.' 'A Reader': 'A. C. Benson, *Edward FitzGerald*.' September. R. Heath: 'The Great Divorce in France.' T. M. Lindsay: 'Revivals.' E. D. Morel: 'Belgium and the Congo.' F. M. Davenport: 'The Religion of the American Negro.' E. M. Caillard: 'Centres of Scientific and Religious Thought.' W. Hutchinson: 'Evolutionary Ethics of Marriage and Divorce.' 'A Reader': 'Kropotkin, *Ideals and Realities in Russian Literature*'; 'A. C. Swinburne, *Love's Cross-Currents*.'

*The Catholic World* (Vol. LXXXI. Nos. 484-6. July-September 1905. New York). W. F. Dennehy: 'Dublin Castle in 1798.' P. C. Standing: 'Was Blake a Poet?' J. C. Monaghan: 'Industrial Education in Germany.' J. J. Fox: 'A Catholic and the Bible, VI.' Reviews. 'W. Barry, *Ernest Renan*.' 'H. Münsterberg, *The Eternal Life*.' 'Lefébure, *Portraits de Croyants au XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle*.' Montalembert, Cochin, Rio, and Guthlin. 'G. Le Hardy, *Histoire de Nazareth et de ses sanctuaires*.' 'A volume of extraordinary value.' 'W. Osler, *Æquanimitas*.' 'S. Lee, *Great Englishmen of the Sixteenth Century*.' 'Stock, *Short Handbook of Missions*.' August. J. C. Monaghan: 'Race Suicide in France.' R. F. O'Connor: 'Catholicism and the Japanese.' K. Brégy: 'The Poetry of Francis Thompson.' J. J. Fox: 'Professor Sterrett on *The Freedom of Authority*.' J. F. Brady: 'The Teaching of Christian Doctrine.' Reviews. 'Mrs. Maxwell Scott, *Fotheringay*.' 'A. Lang, *John Knox*.' 'Birkle-Lemaistre, *The Solesmes Plain-Chant*.' A lengthy criticism. September. E. A. Pace: 'Modern Psychology and Catholic Education.' G. Tyrrell, S. J.: 'The Limits of the Development Theory.' B. Hurst: 'The Founder of Modern Croatia.' Bishop Strossmayer. E. Taunton: 'F. A. Gasquet, *Henry III. and the Church*.' Reviews. 'E. Martin, *St. Columban (540-615)*.' 'H. Hemmer, *Politique Religieuse et Séparation*.' 'Vicente de Meaux, *Souvenirs Politiques, 1871-7*.' 'P. Viollet, *Infailibilité et Syllabus: Réponse aux "Études"*.' 'A. B. C. Dunbar, *A Dictionary of Sainly Women*.' 'A. Sadlier, *Elizabeth Seton, Foundress of the American Sisters of Charity*.'

*The Monthly Review* (Nos. 58-60. July-September 1905. John Murray). E. J. Solano: 'Scandinavia in the Scales of the Future.' 'John Davidson: Realist.' Sir A. Clay: 'Free Meals for Underfed Children: a Means to an End.' In reply to Mr. F. H. Barrow (*M.R.* May 1905). A. Symons: 'Gustave Moreau.' C. L. H. Dempster: 'The Patriot Duke [Michelangelo Caetani] of Sermoneta.' Reviews. 'G. M. Trevelyan, *England under the Stuarts*'; 'Life

and Letters of J. H. Shorthouse.' August. (The late) F. Max Müller: 'Some of my Visitors.' A. St. L. Westall: 'Nelson and the Trafalgar Centenary.' E. A. Baughan: 'Richard Strauss and Programme Music.' R. J. Shrimpton: 'Land Settlement System in Canada.' H. C. Wylly: 'The Soldiers of the Sirkar.' Interesting Indian information. W. H. Hudson: 'The Serpent in Literature.' E. Hutton: 'Cordova and Seville.' C. A. Barnicoat: 'Imperial Co-operation in Education.' E. Sichel, *Catherine de' Medici and the French Reformation*. September. M. F. Sandars: 'Alphonse Daudet.' B. Tozer: 'The Increasing Popularity of the Erotic Novel.' Supported by statistics. G. C. Nuttall: 'Can Plants Feel?' J. H. Rose: 'New Light on the Death of Murat.' F. Carrel: 'East and West.' D. G. McChesney: 'On Catalogue Reading.' F. Boyle: 'Savages and Clothes.' A. Cecil: 'Dean Church.'

*The English Historical Review* (Vol. XX. No. 79. July 1905. Longmans). W. Warde Fowler: 'Notes on Gaius Gracchus, II.' W. T. Waugh: 'Sir John Oldcastle.' E. Broxap: 'The Sieges of Hull during the Great Civil War.' W. H. Stevenson: 'The Alleged Settlement of the Parisii in Lincolnshire.' A. M. Allen: 'Date of the "Albertine" Statutes of Verona.' A. Clark: 'Serfdom on an Essex Manor [Chatham Hall], 1308-1378.' W. L. Newman: 'The Correspondence of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, and Pier Candido Decembrio.' C. Hughes: 'Nicholas Faunt's Discourse touching the Office of Principal Secretary of State, &c., 1592.' Printed from MS. Bodl. Tanner 80. C. L. Falkiner: 'Correspondence of Archbishop Stone and the Duke of Newcastle, I. (1752-3).' Reviews. A. H. J. Greenidge: 'C. Renel, *Cultes Militaires de Rome: les Enseignes*.' W. A. Goligher: 'Greenidge, *History of Rome*, I.' A. Gardner: 'C. Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire*.' E. W. Brooks: 'E. A. Freeman, *Western Europe in the Fifth Century and in the Eighth Century*.' Enormous list of errata. F. C. Conybeare: 'F. Macler, *Histoire d'Héracius par l'Évêque Sébôs*.' From the Armenian. A. G. Little: 'J. D. Le Roulx, *Les Hospitaliers en Terre-Sainte et à Chypre (1100-1310)*.' A. M. Cooke: 'Boehmer, *S. Francisci Opuscula*, etc.' M. Bateson: 'Bliss and Twemlow, *Papal Letters*: V. 1396-1404, VI. 1405-1415.' P. S. Allen: 'Cramer-Pijper, *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica*.' F. V. Dickens: 'Murdoch and Yamagata, *History of Japan (1542-1651)*.' E. Armstrong: 'A. W. Whitehead, *Gaspard de Coligny*.' Very favourable. J. B. Mullinger: 'Frere, *English Church (1558-1625)*' and 'Hutton, *English Church (1625-1714)*.' Unfavourable to latter. E. C. K. Gonner: 'W. Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry and Commerce*' (3rd edition). J. B. Bury: 'T. Schieman, *Geschichte Russlands unter Kaiser Nikolaus I.*, I.' H. Bradley: 'Duignan, *Worcestershire Place-Names*.' G. B. G[ray]: 'R. Laqueur, *Kritische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch*.' J. B. B[ury]: 'Haury, *Procopii Opera*.' T. F. T[out]: 'Register of Walter Giffard, Archbishop of York (1266-1279).' Surtees Society. 'Moltesen, *Acta Pontificum Danica*.' 'R. Nisbet Bain, *Scandinavia*.' 'Pritchard, *Cardigan Priory*.'

*The Economic Review* (Vol. XV. No. 3. July 1905. Rivingtons). R. L. Outley: 'The Relation between Church and State.' H. V. Toynbee: 'The Problem of the Unemployed.' H. S. Holland and J. Carter: 'Commercial Morality.' Reviews. L. L. Price: 'Compatriots' Club Lectures.' E. Cannan: 'Carver, *The Distribution of Wealth*.' S. Ball: 'Knoop, *Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration*.' A. W. F. Blunt: 'Drage, *Trade Unions*.' W. W. Longford: 'Ashley, *Progress of the German Working Classes*.'

*Revue Biblique Internationale* (N.S. Vol. II. No. 3. July 1905. Paris: Lecoiffe). J. Wehrlé: 'De la nature du Dogme.' E. Cuq: 'Le Mariage à Babylone d'après les lois de Hammourabi.' V. Scheil: 'Documents archaïques en écriture proto-élamite.' Illustrated. L. Delaporte: 'Fragments thébains du Nouveau Testament. I. John i. 1-ii. 8, ii. 10-iii. 7, iii. 9-21, iii. 24-iv. 20. Prints text from MS. Berol. Bibl. Reg. 408. With photograph. A. van Hoonacker: 'Un nom grec (ΑΔΗΞ) dans le Livre de Jonas (ii. 7).' J. Planès: 'Noms des plantes recueillies en Arabie Pétrée et dans le pays de Moab (février-mars 1902).' J. Dissard: 'Les migrations et les vicissitudes de la tribu des 'Amer.' R. Savignac: 'Découverte d'une statue à Ascalon.' With photograph. M. Abel: 'Fouilles anglaises de Gézer.' Recensions. A. Condamin: 'Marti, *Dodekapheton*.' 'Harper, *Amos and Hosea*.' S. Perret: 'T. André, *Les Apocryphes de l'A. T.*,' et 'Jacquier, *Histoire des Livres du N. T.*' P. Magnien: J. Weiss, *Das älteste Evangelium*.' B. Allo: 'J. E. Hand, *Ideals of Science and Faith*.' Favourable. 'Balestri, *Sacrorum Bibliorum Fragmenta copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani. III. Novum Testamentum*.' 'Horner, *Coptic Version of the N. T.*, III., IV.' 'A. Seeberg, *Das Evangelium Christi*.' 'J. E. Niederhuber, *Die Lehre des hl. Ambrosius vom Reiche Gottes auf Erden*.' 'W. Emery Barnes, *The Peshitta Psalter*.' Favourable. 'V. Zapletal, *Das Buch Kôhelet*.' 'A. S. Peake, *Job*.' 'J. Hunger, *Becherwahrungung . . . nach zwei Keilschrifttexten aus der Hammurabi-Zeit*.' 'S. Daiches, *Altbabylonische Rechtsurkunden aus der Zeit der Hammurabi-Dynastie*.'

*Revue Bénédictine* (Vol. XXII. No. 3. July 1905. Abbaye de Maredsous). G. Morin: 'Fragments inédits et jusqu'à présent uniques d'antiphonaire gallican.' From MS. Paris Bibl. Nat. Nouv. Acquis. lat. 1628.' J. Chapman: 'Le témoignage de Jean le Presbytre au sujet de S. Marc et de S. Luc.' U. Berlière: 'Les Chapitres généraux de l'Ordre de S. Benoît: Notes supplémentaires.' R. Ancel: 'La question de Sienné et la politique du Cardinal Carlo Carafa (*fin*).' H. Leclercq: 'Mélanges d'épigraphie chrétienne.' C. Baur: 'A. Bigelmair, *Zeno von Verona: Habilitationsschrift*.' G. Morin: 'H. Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques*.'

*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (Vol. VI. No. 3. July 1905. Louvain). L. Saltet: 'Les sources de l'Epanorthos de Théodore, II.' M. Vaes: 'La Papauté et l'Eglise franque à l'époque de Grégoire le Grand (590-604).' J. M. Vidal: 'Notice sur les Œuvres du pape Benoît XII.' L. Willaert: 'Négociations politico-religieuses entre l'Angleterre et les Pays-Bas catholiques (1598-1625), II.' J. P. Kirsch: 'Le R. P. Denifle, O.P. (1844-1905). Notice biographique et bibliographique.' Comptes rendus. T. Calmes: 'Horn-Golubovich, *Ichnographiae locorum et monumentorum Terrae Sanctae*.' 'Affagart-Chavanon, *Relation de la Terre-Sainte (1533-4)*.' 'G. Le Hardy, *Histoire de Nazareth*.' G. Rasneur: 'Jacquier, *Histoire des livres du N. T.*, II.' 'A. Bigelmair, *Zeno von Verona*.' J. van Cauwenbergh: 'Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*.' J. Flamion: 'C. Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire*.' 'Linsenmayer, *Die Bekämpfung des Christentums bis zum Tode des Kaisers Julian*.' L. Baillet: 'Kirsch, *Zur Geschichte der katholischen Beichte*.' A reply to Bp. Herzog. G. Voisin: 'H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea*.' R. Deschepper: 'Carlyle, *Medieval Political Theory in the West*, I.' A. Dufourcq: 'H. Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques*.' E. van der Mynsbrugge: 'Kurth, *Chartes de l'abbaye de Saint-Hubert en Ardenne*, I.'

G. Monchamp: 'Kurth, *Notger de Liège et la civilisation au X<sup>e</sup> siècle.*' H. Nelis: 'Schiaparelli, *I Diplomi di Berengario I.*' J. Mahieu: 'P. H. Dunand, *Études critiques sur l'histoire de Jeanne d'Arc.*' T. van Oppenraaij: 'Cramer-Pijper, *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica.*' J. Theissen: 'G. Doublet, *Jean du Ferrier et Le jansénisme dans l'ancien diocèse de Vence.*' A. de Ridder: 'Aulard, *Le culte de la Raison et de l'Être suprême (1793-4).*' A. Mathiez, *La théophilanthropie et le culte décadaire (1796-1801).*' L. de Laborie, *Paris sous Napoléon.*' P. de Puniet: 'C. F. Atchley, *Ordo Romanus Primus.*' H. Dumaine: 'F. C. Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe.*' N. J. D. White, *Latin Writings of St. Patrick.*' C. H. Firth, *Plea for the Historical Teaching of History.*

*Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* (Nos. 6-8. June, July-October 1905. Paris: Lecoffre). Mgr. P. Batiffol: 'Pour l'histoire des Dogmes.' E. Franon: 'Un scolastique anti-intellectualiste, M. H. D. Sertillanges.' J. Calvet: 'Une théorie récente sur les *Pensées* de Pascal.' P. Semeria, *La Messa nella sua storia e nei suoi simboli.*' Laveille, Jean-Marie de La Mennais.' P. Desjardins, *Catholicisme et Critique, réflexions d'un profane sur l'affaire Loisy.*' July-October. L. de Grandmaison: 'Qu'est-ce qu'un Dogme?' L. Saltet: 'La formation de la légende des papes Libère et Félix.' 'Lettres de MM. Laberthonnière et Sertillanges.' 'Réplique de M. Franon.' F. A. Gasquet, *Life of Gregory the Great by a Monk of Whitby.*' Many, *Prælectiones de Sacra Ordinatione.*

*Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature religieuses* (Vol. X. No. 4. July-August 1905. Paris: 74 Boulevard Saint-Germain). A. Loisy: 'Le Pardon divin (Matt. xviii. 10-14, Luc xv.).' C. Cochin: 'Recherches sur Stefano Colonna, I.' J. Labourt: 'Le patriarche Timothée et les Nestoriens sous les Abbassides.' P. Lejay: 'Ancienne Philologie chrétienne: V, Avant Nicée; VI, L'Église nestorienne d'Orient; VII, Après Nicée.' J. Dalbret: 'Littérature religieuse moderne.'

*Analecta Bollandiana* (Tom. XXIV. Fasc. III. July 1905. Brussels). Dom H. Quentin: 'Passio S. Dioscori.' From MSS. Brit. Mus. Cotton, Tib. D. III. and Cotton, Nero E.I. A. Poncelet: 'La date de la fête des SS. Félix et Regula.' P. Peeters: 'Historia S. Abramii ex apographo arabico.' Latin translation. From a Vatican and a Leipzig MS. E. Hocedez: 'Lettre de Pierre Ranzano au pape Pie II (1458-64) sur le martyre du B. Antoine de Rivoli.' From MS. Bibl. Casanat. 112 (A. IV. 50). Bulletin. H. D[elehay]: 'Audollent, *Carthage Romaine* (B.C. 146-A.D. 698).' Dom Butler, *Lausiac History*, II.' 'Budge, *The Book of Paradise* (Meux MS. 6).' F. de Mély, *Exuviae Sacrae Constantinopolitanae*, III.) (continues Riant); W. Meyer, *Die Legende des h. Albanus des Protomartyr Angliae in Texten vor Beda*; F. Nau, *Histoire de Thais*; Bigelmair, *Zeno von Verona*. A. Poncelet: 'Harnack, *Der Brief des britischen Königs Lucius an den Papst Eleutherius*' (Lucius turns out to be Abgar of Edessa); A. L'Huillier, *Le patriarche S. Benoît*. P. [Peeters]: 'Schwietz, *Das morgenländische Mönchtum*'; Basset, *Le synaxaire arabe Jacobite (rédaction copte)*; Riedel-Crum, *Canons of Athanasius*. V[an] O[rtroy]: 'Thurston-Slater, *Eadmeri monachi Cantuariensis Tractatus*'; *Bibliotheca Franciscana ascetica medii ævi*; P. Sabatier, *Regula Antiqua Tertii Ordinis S. Francisci*; P. Suau, *S. François de Borgia (1510-72)*. H. Moretus: 'F. A. Gasquet, *Life of Gregory the Great by a Monk of Whitby.*' A. Poncelet: 'Codices archivi capituli S. Petri in Vaticano (continued): Codices arch. cap. S. Iohannis in Laterano.'

*Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* (1905. No. 1. Paris: A. Picard). J. B. Rebourts: 'Quelques manuscrits de musique byzantine (*fin*). MS. 332 Jerusalem, Greek text. F. Tournebize: 'Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie (*suite*).' [Gregory Dgha—John VII. the Magnificent]. F. Nau and L. Clugnet: 'Vies et récits d'Anachorètes (IV<sup>e</sup>–VII<sup>e</sup> siècles).' Greek texts from MS. Paris Gr. 1596. Dom P. de Meester: 'Le dogme de l'Immaculée Conception et la doctrine de l'Église grecque (*suite*).' P. Girard: 'Sivas, huit siècles d'histoire (1021–1820).' Mélanges. S. Vailhé: 'Chrysippe, prêtre de Jérusalem († 479 A.D.).' F. Nau: 'Le Congrès international des Orientalistes (Avril 1905).' Bibliographie. L. Bréhier: 'Audolent, Carthage Romaine.' F. Nau: 'Basset, *Synaxaire arabe Jacobite*.' Fouard, *Les Origines de l'Église*.

*Revue des Questions Historiques* (N.S. Vol. XXXIV. No. 155. July 1905. Paris: 5 Rue Saint-Simon). E. Lesne: 'Hincmar et l'empereur Lothaire.' E. Vacandard: 'Le Cursus: son origine, son histoire, son emploi dans la Liturgie.' An interesting treatise on rhythm. J. Richard: 'Origines de la Nonciature de France.' P. Allard: 'M. Harnack et le nombre des martyrs.' Criticizes the '*Mission und Ausbreitung*.' A. d'Herbomey: 'Les "Heures de Chantilly" et l'Exposition des Primitifs français.' Bulletin. M. Besnier: 'B. Wolff-Beckh, *Kaiser Titus und der Jüdische Krieg*.' Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea*. A. Vogt: 'Baudrillart, *S. Paulin de Nole*.' J. Gay, *Le pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient (1342–52)*. L. Celiér: 'Leclercq, *Les Martyrs*, III.' E. G. Ledos: 'B. Monod, *Le Moine Guibert et son temps (1053–1124)*.' G. B. de Puchesse: 'C. Merki, *La reine Margot (1553–1615)*.'

*Studi Religiosi* (Vol. V. No. 4. July–August 1905. Florence). G. Semeria: 'Per la fede religiosa in Italia' (Arturo Graf e Giovanni Pascoli). G. Grabinski: 'Le Origini del Concordato.' S. Minocchi: 'Il Salterio davidico: Nuove ricerche di critica biblica.' E. Buonaiuti: 'Segni dei tempi.' V. Bianchi-Cagliosi: 'Il momento religioso-politico in Francia.' S. Minocchi: 'Versione di Isaia xii. 1–xv. 9.' Reviews. 'Preuschen, *Zwei Gnostischen Hymnen*.' Semeria, *La Messa nella sua storia e nei suoi simboli*. 'Klein, *Au Pays de "La vie intense"*.' A study of America.

*Teologisk Tidsskrift* (Vol. VI. No. 4. Copenhagen). F. E. Lundsgaard: 'Autoriteter, Autoritet og Aabenbaring.' O. P. Monrad: 'Grundpunktet i Religionens Vaesen med saerligt Hensyn til Prof. Höfdings Religionsfilosofi.' M. I. Gjessing: 'Kirkeligt Liv i Norge i 1903 og 1904.' C. Glarbo: 'Hermann, *Die sittlichen Weisungen Jesu*.' Bachmann, *Die Sittenlehre Jesu und ihre Bedeutung für die Gegenwart*. 'Zöckler, *Die Tugendlehre des Christentums*.'

*The East and the West* (Vol. III. No. 11. July 1905. S.P.G.). 'Baptism within the Purdah: a Suggestion.' Baptism by Deaconesses. T. F. V. Buxton: 'Uganda: a Retrospect and an Inquiry.' W. N. Bitton: 'The Educational Outlook in China.' E. Stock: 'An Early Anglican Mission to the Eastern Churches.' H. G. Daniell-Bainbridge: 'The Mission of Help to the Church in S. Africa.' J. H. Wyckoff: 'Islam in India.' H. A. Hawkins: 'The Work of the Church of England among the Maories of New Zealand.' H. D. Griswold: 'A Christian Fakir.' Chet Rám. J. C. V. Durell: 'The Effect of Foreign Missions upon the Development of the Christian Faith.' Reviews. 'South African Native Affairs Commission, 1903–5.' 'Educational Systems of the Chief Crown Colonies and Possessions of the British Empire (Special Reports on Educational Subjects, XII.–XIV.).' A long review.



## BOOKS RECEIVED.

The more important will be reviewed or noticed in articles as space permits.

## OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.

CARTER, T.—*Shakespeare and Holy Scripture: with the Version he used.* Pp. viii + 492. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 15s. net.

CARUS-WILSON, MRS. A.—*Saint Paul, Missionary to the Nations.* A Scheme for the Study of his Life and Writings. Pp. viii + 88. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 1s.

DRIVER, S. R., and KIRKPATRICK, A. F.—*The Higher Criticism.* Three Papers. Pp. xii + 72. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 1s. net.

KENT, C. F.—*Israel's Historical and Biographical Narratives.* 'The Students' Old Testament,' II. With Maps and Chronological Chart. Pp. xxxii + 506. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 12s. net.

KÖNIG, E.—*The Bible and Babylon.* Translated from the German by W. T. FILTER, with a Preface by DEAN WACE. Pp. 138. (Religious Tract Society.) 2s.

MATHESON, G.—*The Representative Men of the New Testament.* Pp. viii + 368. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s.

SANDAY, W.—*The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel.* Eight lectures on the Morse foundation delivered in the Union Seminary, New York, in October and November 1904. Pp. xvi + 268. (Clarendon Press.) 7s. 6d. net.

SMITH, D.—*In the Days of His Flesh: The Earthly Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.* Pp. xlii + 550. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 10s. 6d. net.

## APOLOGETICS AND PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

HALL, F. J.—*The Doctrine of God.* Second Edition, revised. Pp. xii + 166. (London: W. Walker.) 4s. 6d. net.

HARRIS, C.—*Pro Fide: a Defence of Natural and Revealed Religion.* Pp. xvi + 572. (Murray.) 10s. 6d. net.

HOLDEN, H. W.—*Pro Christo: an Examination of Foundations.* Pp. 104. (Skeffingtons.) 2s.

KER, W.—*Immortality, Whence? and for Whom?: An Essay for the Unlearned.* Second Edition, revised. Pp. viii + 168. (Elliot Stock.) 6d.

SCHULTZ, H.—*Outlines of Christian Apologetics for use in Lectures.* Authorized translation from the Second enlarged Edition (1902) by A. B. NICHOLS. Pp. xii + 328. (The Macmillan Co.) 7s. 6d. net.

## CHURCH HISTORY.

EVETTS, B.—*History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria, II., Peter I. to Benjamin I. (661).* Arabic text edited, translated and annotated. 'Patrologia orientalis,' I. 4. Pp. 383-518. (Paris: Firmin-Didot.)

## DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY.

DONALDSON, J.—*The Westminster Confession of Faith and the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England: the Legal, Moral and Religious Aspect of Subscription to them.* Pp. xii + 168. (Longmans.) 3s. 6d. net.



DRURY, T. W.—*The Lord's Supper*. Pp. 44. (Bemrose.) 6d.

ELGOOD, J. C.—*An Inquiry, based on Scripture, into the Views held by Praxeas, who lived in the Second Century, respecting the Christian Faith*. Pp. 28. (Skeffingtons.) 1s.

#### SERMONS.

BEAUMONT, J. A.—*Walking Circumspectly and other Sermons*. Preached in St. John's Church, St. John's Wood Road. Pp. x + 224. (Skeffingtons.) 3s. 6d. net.

HODGES, G.—*The Human Nature of the Saints*. Pp. iv + 244. (Skeffingtons.) 3s. 6d. net.

MOOR, C.—*The Plain Man's Life*. Addresses preached during Lent 1905. Pp. vi + 84. (Skeffingtons.) 2s.

MURPHY, J. B. C.—*The Seed and the Soul*. A series of Plain Short Sermons. Pp. xii + 230. (Skeffingtons.) 2s. net. The first of a series to be called 'Skeffington's Sermon Library.'

WILMOT-BUXTON, H. J.—*Day by Day Duty*.—Thirty Plain Sermons including many for the principal Church Seasons. Pp. xii + 260. (Skeffingtons.) 5s.

#### DEVOTIONAL THEOLOGY.

HARDERN, T. B.—*A Manual of the Collects from the Book of Common Prayer with simple explanation*. With Preface by Dean LEFROY. Pp. xii + 172. (Skeffingtons.) 2s. 6d. net.

MORTIMER, A. G.—*It Ringeth to Evensong: Thoughts for Advancing Years*. Being some Readings on the Trials and the Blessings of Old Age. Pp. xii + 208. (Skeffingtons.) 3s. 6d.

#### PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

CONDER, E. B.—*Helps for the Catechist and Aids to Teaching*. Forty Instructions and Homilies. Pp. x + 122. (Skeffingtons.) 2s. net.

ERASMUS.—*A Book called in Latin 'Enchiridion Militis Christiani' and in English, 'The Manual of the Christian Knight,' replenished with most wholesome Precepts, made by the famous Clerk Erasmus of Rotterdam: to which is added a new and marvellous profitable Preface*. Pp. vi + 288. (Methuen.) 3s. 6d. net. A delightful little book.

JOHNSTON, R. E.—*The Eternal King and His Kingdom*. Lessons and Catechizings for the Children of the Church. First Series (52 weeks). *The Preparation for the Coming of the King*. Pp. viii + 146. (Skeffingtons.) 2s. net.

WILKINSON, D. H. D.—*Systematic Scripture Study: Illustrated Methods of Bible Study for Beginners and others*. Pp. 120. (C.M.S. Office.) 1s. 6d.

#### MISSIONS.

PARSONS, E. C.—*Christus Liberator: an outline study of Africa*. With an Introduction by Sir H. H. JOHNSTON, K.C.B. Pp. viii + 310. (The Macmillan Co.) 2s. net.

#### LITURGICA.

MCGARVEY, W., and BURNETT, C. P. A.—*The Ceremonies of the Mass arranged conformably to the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer*. Pp. lxxvi + 214. (New York and London: Longmans.) 7s. 6d. net.

MACGREGOR, D.—*The Rathen Manual*. Edited with Translation and Notes. Pp. vi + 84. (Aberdeen: Printed for the Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society.)

## BIOGRAPHY.

A. K. H.—*Angélique of Port-Royal, 1591–1661*. Pp. xxxviii + 408. (Skeffingtons.) 10s. net.

LATHBURY, D. C.—*Dean Church*. 'Leaders of the Church, 1800–1900,' Vol. I. Pp. xii + 230. (Mowbray.) 3s. 6d. net.

WILBERFORCE, R. G.—*Bishop Wilberforce*. 'Leaders of the Church,' Vol. II. Pp. viii + 272. (Mowbray.) 3s. 6d. net.

## GENERAL LITERATURE.

COLERIDGE, S. T.—*Poems*. Selected and arranged with an Introduction and notes by ARTHUR SYMONS. With a frontispiece in photogravure. Pp. i + 222. (Methuen.) 2s. 6d. net. A beautiful little edition.

DONEY, M.—*Songs of the Real*. Pp. viii + 88. (Methuen.) 3s. 6d. net. Reprinted from the *Westminster Gazette*, *Spectator*, etc.

DANTE ALIGHIERI.—*The Purgatorio*. Rendered into Spenserian English by C. G. WRIGHT. With a frontispiece in photogravure. Pp. xii + 304. (Methuen.) 2s. 6d. net. Gives also Dr. Toynebee's text of the original.

GASQUET, ABBOT F. A.—*The Nun's Rule*. Being the *Ancrén Riwle* modernised by James Morton. Edited with an Introduction. 'The King's Classics.' Pp. xxviii + 340. (Moring: The De La More Press.) 3s. 6d. net. An interesting and beautifully printed little book.

SCHOLES, T. E. S.—*Glimpses of the Ages, or the 'Superior' and 'Inferior' Races, so-called, discussed in the Light of Science and History*. Pp. xviii + 410. (John Long.) 12s. net.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.—*The Hundred and first Report*. 1905. Pp. xvi + 266. (146 Queen Victoria Street, E.C.) 1s.

— *Seed Corn for the World*. A Popular Illustrated Report for 1904–1905. Pp. x + 104.

DESJARDINS, P.—*Catholicisme et Critique: Réflexions d'un Profane sur l'affaire Loisy*. Pp. viii + 124. (Paris: aux Bureaux des Livres Entretiens.) 2 francs.

EGERTON, HAKLUYT.—*The Maintenance of Denominational Teaching*. A Note upon Section 7 (i) of the Education Act, 1902. Pp. 112. (G. Allen.) 1s. 6d. net.

HAGGARD, H. RIDER.—*The Poor and the Land*. Being a Report on the Salvation Army Colonies in the United States and at Hadleigh, England, with a scheme of National Land Settlement and an Introduction. Pp. xlii + 158. (Longmans.) 1s. 6d. With 12 illustrations. A most admirable reprint of the Blue book [Cd. 2562.]

SIDGWICK, H. (the late).—*Lectures on the Philosophy of Kant and other Philosophical Lectures and Essays*. Pp. x + 474. (Macmillan.) 10s. net.

*The Expository Times*, Vol. XVI. (Oct. 1904–Sept. 1905.) Edited by J. HASTINGS. Pp. viii + 568. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.) 7s. 6d. A handsome and useful volume.